THE OLD ENGLISH CHARMS.

PERHAPS in no section of Old English literature have traditional views been left so comfortably undisturbed as in the case of the charms. This immunity from criticism has been due in part to the lack of a convenient and complete edition, which has now been supplied, for the metrical charms at least, by Mr Felix Grendon. Grendon himself deals with the charms chiefly from the standpoint of folk-lore, and seldom questions current readings and interpretations. I propose here to discuss such of these as seem to me ill founded, and to offer solutions of some passages which have remained obscure. Except in Section IV, I have used Grendon's texts for quotation and reference, as they summarize current views and incorporate some improvements in the better-known older editions; but references are given also to one or another of the latter, differences being noted only when they affect the matter under discussion[1].

I. The charm *Wiþ færstice* (G., A. 1; W., i. 317) is too well known to need quotation. Grendon gives the orthodox interpretation in his analysis: 'The charm falls naturally into five divisions: (1) (ll. 1, 2), a recipe for a magic herbal concoction; (2) (ll. 2—5), the epic introduction; (3) (ll. 6—17), the attack of the flying demons and the exorcist's three retaliatory measures—flying dart, knife forged by the smith, and spears wrought by six smiths; (4) (ll. 18—28), the principal incantation; (5) (l. 29), a final direction to the exorcist.' I think that this view overlooks the prime characteristic of the charm. I would suggest that it is a 'naming' charm; its first aim is to define the evil, and by identifying it to acquire power over it.

[1] Abbreviations:
C. = Cockayne, *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England.*
G. = Grendon, *Anglo-Saxon Charms*, Journal of American Folk-Lore, No. LXXXIV.
Grimm = Grimm's *Teutonic Mythology*, 4th ed., trans. Stallybrass.
L. = Leonhardi, *Kleinere ags. Denkmäler.*
Sch. = Schlutter, *Anglo-Saxonica*, in *Anglia*, Vols. xxx and xxxi.
W. = Grein-Wülker, *Bibl. der altengl. Poesie.*

The charm falls into two main divisions:

(1) Description of the attack, in three sections, each concluded by the exorcismal formula 'Ut, lytel spere, gif her inne sie.'

(*a*) The exorcist has *heard* the wind-demons riding over the land (ll. 3—6).

(*b*) From the shelter of his shield, he has *seen* sorceresses exercising their art and flinging their spears (ll. 7—12)[1].

(*c*) He knows how the elf-smiths sit forging weapons (ll. 13—17).

From one of these sources the attack must have proceeded. To name the source is the first step towards defeating the attack; and the naming is supported in (*a*) by a hint of successful resistance (l. 5), in (*b*)—the most important section—by a similar hint and by a threat of reprisal, in (*c*) by the account of the forging of the knife by the (friendly) smith. At the end of each suggestion of source follows the conjuration. With the correct naming of its origin, the actual 'spear' is conjured out.

It remains to heal the wound which the 'spear' has caused, and this is the aim of the second division of the charm (l. 18 ff.). If any scrap of iron remains in the wound, it shall melt. Each region possibly affected by the shot is named—a frequent feature of charms—and so the charm proper is completed. Next it is confirmed by threefold ceremonial application of the salve prescribed in ll. 1, 2. The salving is introduced by a recapitulation of the three possible sources of the shot (ll. 23, 24), and at each application one source is again named (ll. 25—6). I am inclined to think that the direction 'Nim þonne þæt seax,' etc., given at the end of the charm, is to be applied at l. 25, and that with each of the three phrases 'ðis ðe to bote esa gescotes,' 'ðis ðe to bote ylfa gescotes,' 'ðis ðe to bote hægtessan gescotes,' the salve would be 'stroked' onto the part affected, with the knife. Of this more later. The charm concludes with the triumphant banning of the evil and the command of cure.

Discussion of difficulties may begin with the ceremonial directions. These are meagre, and, as very often, probably incomplete. Before the charm is given only the prescription 'Feferfuige and seo reade netele, ðe ðurh ærn inwyxð, and wegbrade; wyll in buteran.' Here the difficulty lies in 'ðe ðurh ærn inwyxð.' Grendon translates 'which

[1] Cf. *Hávamál* 151, where Oðinn can work magic on an arrow *if only he sees it*:

þat kannk et fimta, ef sék af fári skotinn
flein í folki vaþa:
flýgra svá stint, at ek stǫþvigak,
ef ek hann sjónum of sék.

For the Edda I quote throughout from *Die Lieder der älteren Edda*, herausg. Hildebrand, 2te Aufl. Gering, Paderborn, 1904.

grows through the house'—'through' apparently to signify 'throughout.' Grimm's 'through a fence' comes nearer to the meaning; I think we might expand 'which grows through the wall into the house.' The strong-growing nettle makes its way through the loose-built wall.

The only other direction for ceremonial follows the charm: 'Nim þonne þæt seax, ado on wætan.' The last word causes some obscurity. Grimm, followed by Brooke, interprets it simply as 'water'; and we may compare the charm *Wiþ ælfcynne* (G., E. 8), where the herbs used for the salve, after their juices have been extracted, are thrown into running water. If this view is correct, the idea is of course to transfer the pain to the water, as in so many charms; and the knife symbolizes the 'færstice.' Against this explanation we have to note that 'wæter' rather than 'wætan,' would be the natural word; that a spear rather than a knife would be used as exact symbol of the pain (cf. the exorcismal refrain 'Ut, lytel spere'); and that we are left without any direction for use of the prescribed salve. It therefore seems preferable to translate 'wætan' by 'liquid,' with Grendon, taking it to refer to the salve; though in this case also it is scarcely the word to be expected; 'sealf' would better describe the product of the prescription.

Grendon suggests that 'the knife is apparently to be used on some dummy representing the evil spirits.' Cases of such 'sympathetic' magic against human beings are of course common, but I do not know of any against superhuman forces. (Cases of rough usage of fetishes do not offer a parallel, since the fetish actually contains the spirit to be coerced.) It would be hard even to imagine such an intention here; for the immediate object of such sympathetic magic must be in some way connected with the ulterior object, and how would the 'dummy image' be obtained when the powers combated are unknown? Would it represent an 'os,' or an 'ælf,' or a 'hægtesse'? The name remains the only vulnerable point in the unknown sender, and hence we have the elaborate naming formulas of the first part of the charm. The pain itself may however be symbolized; it is constantly referred to as 'lytel spere.' The ceremonial direction names not a 'spere' but a 'seax'; and the change, arbitrary if the 'seax' is merely to be plunged into liquid, becomes comprehensible if, as I suggested above, the direction applies at l. 25, and salve is stroked onto the painful region with the 'seax.' A knife would lend itself to such use much more conveniently than a spear; and the pain is not exactly symbolized—a general connection of ideas would suffice for this purpose. Line 13 may be a glorification of the knife to be used; compare the use, in another charm *Wiþ ylfa*

gescotum, of 'þæt seax þe þæt hæfte sie fealo hryðeres horn, and sien iii ærene næglas on.'

This interpretation is orthodox in the assumption that l. 13 suggests help against the evil. But, according to the orthodox view, this help lies in a threat of reprisal, which is developed in l. 16. In the interpretation outlined above, I find in l. 16 the necessary formal naming of the third possible source of the 'shot'; the smiths are elf-smiths. In support of this view, I would urge that a threefold naming occurs twice, in ll. 23 f., and 25 f.; the evil is 'esa gescot, oððe...ylfa gescot, oððe...hægtessan gescot.' We should expect to find the same threefold naming in the earlier part of the charm, and the correspondence is clear for the first two: the wind-demons who ride noisily and savagely over the land are the 'es' (if one may invent the form); the 'mihtigan wif' are the 'hægtessan.' To balance the 'ylfe,' there remain the 'smiðas' (l. 16). Elf-smiths are familiar in Teutonic mythology (cf. Grimm, II, 447 f.), so that the identification is in no way improbable. The only difficulty lies in the reference first to the one smith who made a knife, then to the six who wrought spears, and this difficulty is not solved by the suggestion that both references merely threaten reprisal. Each of the other two sections first names a possible source of the evil and then suggests successful resistance or reprisal, and this seems natural here too; against the elf-smiths' spears, causing the stitch, is set the knife which is later to be used in the salving, as suggested above. In this case we should transpose ll. 13 f. and l. 16, so as to give first the danger, then the remedy. Respect for the text need not make us hesitate, for here the text is probably corrupt; l. 13 is metrically improbable and l. 14 is pretty certainly incomplete.

Many readings of the last two lines of the charm have been suggested, none entirely satisfactory (for list v. G.). The MS. has 'fled þr̄ on fyrgen hæfde halwestu.' All recent editors agree in the obvious emendation 'fleoh' (or 'fleo') for 'fled,' and the emendation 'heafde' for 'hæfde' follows very simply: the MS. reading is grammatically correct, meaning 'he had a dwelling there on the mountain'—a remark plausible enough, in view of frequent references to the mountains as the home of hostile spirits, to let the scribe, if he wrongly wrote 'fled,' easily continue with 'hæfde' for 'heafde.' The editors who read 'heafde' with the last line strain the sense. There is no point in telling a sufferer from stitch to 'be hale in *head*'; nor even, reading '[oð] heafde,' 'up to the head.' Neither is this arrangement necessary for the metre, for 'hal westu' has a parallel in 'ut, spere,' l. 17; the first vowel in 'spere'

being a 'heavy-short,' and thus equivalent to the first vowel in 'westu,' which is long by position. I therefore support Sweet's reading 'on fyrgenheafde'; but his 'fleo on fyrgenheafde' needs completion. Grendon, slightly varying from Grimm, Ettmüller and Bouterwek, reads 'Fleoh þær on fyrgen, [seo þa flane sende]!' The objection to this is that the being who shot the dart has never hitherto been addressed in the charm, only referred to in the third person; further, as the illness is not ascribed to *possession*, the departure of the 'shooter' would not cure it. Spirits are exorcised only when the illness is due to their possession of the patient's body; in other cases the illness itself is conjured. So throughout our charm, the conjurations are addressed to the 'lytel spere,' to the illness itself; and this is what we must expect in this final conjuration also. I suggest the reading:

Fleoh þær flan on fyrgenheafde!
Hal westu! Helpe ðin drihten!

Compare the command to the wen (G., A. 3):

Wenne, wenne, wenchichenne,
her ne scealt þu timbrien, ne nenne tun habben,
ac þu scealt north eonene to þan nihgan berhge.

II. Very obscure is the curious charm *Wið dweorh* (G., A. 2; W., *Wið weorh*, i, 326). For convenience in reference I reprint Grendon's text:

Man sceal niman vii lytle oflætan, swylce man mid ofrað, and writtan þas naman on ælcre oflætan, Maximianus, Malchus, Johannes, Martinianus, Dionisius, Constantinus, Serafion. Þænne eft þæt galdor þæt her æfter cweð, man sceal singan, ærest on þæt wynstre eare, þænne on þæt swiðre eare, þænne ufan þæs mannes moldan. And ga þænne an mædenman to, and ho hit on his sweoran, and do man swa þry dagas: him bið sona sel.

Her com in gangan, in spider wiht,
hæfde him his haman on handa.
Cwæð þæt þu his hæncgest wære.
Legeþ he his teage an sweoran.
Ongunnan him of þæm lande liþan.
Sona swa hy of þæm lande coman,
þa ongunnan him þa colian.
Þa com ingangan deores sweostar,
þa geændade heo and aðas swor:
ðæt næfre þis ðæm ádlegan derian ne moste,
ne þæm þe þis galdor begytan mihte,
oððe þe þio galdor ongalan cuþe.
Amen, fiat.

With regard to the illness in question, I agree with Grendon that it is some convulsive disease, and not, as Wülker suggested, a tumour. In support of this view we may add to the evidence of another charm *Wið dweorg* (G., E. 11) that the magic names in our charm are those

of the Seven Sleepers, elsewhere invoked against fever (cf. Grendon's note); so that the disease is probably violent or spasmodic in its effects.

Grendon explains this charm as a 'spider-cure.' He thinks that 'hit' (l. 5) refers to 'spider wiht' (l. 7)—a spider is to be hung round the patient's neck. He proceeds 'þu (l. 9) refers to the plaguing dwarf responsible for the attack; and the sense is that the spider-wight is to ride off, using the dwarf-demon as his horse (cf. demons riding men [Grimm, i, 384]). As soon as they have ridden away, the wounds begin to cool.'

This explanation seems to me very much forced. It is far more natural to take 'hit' as referring to 'þæt galdor': the charm is to be worn by the patient as an amulet as well as sung over him, and l. 17 may well refer to this. For similar wearing of charm-writings cf. G., D. 7, D. 8, D. 9, and especially D. 10 (*Wiþ utsihte*): 'Writ þis on swa langum bocfelle, þæt hit mæge befon utan þæt heafod, and hoh on þæs mannes sweoran, þe him þearf sy.'

The 'spider wiht,' I think, is the dwarf himself. For the close connection of dwarf and spider cf. Grimm, pp. 471, 1497; and cf. also the belief that elves often assumed butterfly-form (ibid. 472). The charm *Wiþ huntan bote* (G., C. 4) suggests that certain diseases may have been attributed to dwarfs in spider form; that, like the earwig, or the eft, which, according to a widely-spread superstition, cattle swallow in drinking, the spider crept into the victim's body (probably through the ear, cf. ll. 4 f.) and so possessed him. The victim is then dwarf-ridden, not the dwarf ridden by the spider, as Grendon suggests; the dwarf-spider has laid his harness on his victim's neck.

For this last sentence (l. 10) the MS. reads 'lege ðe his teagean sweoran.' Schlutter's emendation, followed by Grendon, gives 'legeþ he'—a solitary present where every other verb is in the preterite. I suggest 'legde þe,' which gives the expected preterite, supplies a personal reference for 'sweoran,' and follows the preceding line in omitting the pronominal subject.

'Haman' in l. 8 presents some difficulty. Grendon's translation 'harness' (camus) is tempting in view of the following line, but I can find no parallel to support it. The cognate O. N. 'hamr' may shed light on the meaning; it carries the sense of a *disguising* covering, e.g., in *Hávamál*, 156:

> Þat kannk et tiunda, ef ek sé túnriþur
> leika lopti á:
> ek svá vinnk, at þær villar fara
> sinna heimhama
> sinna heimhaga.

Here 'hama' are the magic skins changing the forms of the witches. May not 'hama' in our charm have its ordinary meaning, 'covering,' 'skin,' with this special force? The line would then agree with the suggestion that the 'spider wiht' is no mere spider, but a dwarf who 'had his spider-garb in his hand,' had assumed the form of a spider.

Difficulties thicken in the later lines. Our point of attack may be ll. 14 f. Clearly something should come between these two lines—between the entrance of the 'deores sweostar' and 'þa geændade heo.' We must infer either a lacuna or displacement. The change from singular to plural in ll. 11–13, certain in l. 12, though not in the other two lines, suggests the need of emendation there also. Combining the two inferences, we may perhaps read l. 14 immediately after l. 10. I cannot suggest any explanation of 'deores sweostar'; but apparently she is some benevolent being, and contrives to get the dwarf 'away from the land.' One recalls the charms in which disease is transferred to running water; perhaps some ceremonial directions are omitted here[1] (cf. §§ I and VI).

I support Schlutter's reading of l. 13; so that we read:

Legde þe his teage an sweoran.
Þa com in gangan deores sweostar
. . . . . .
Ongunnan him of þæm lande liþan.
Sona swa hy of þæm lande coman,
þa ongann an him þa haþ acolian.

III. The charm *Wiþ toðece* (G., A. 10; L., 124) opens with a gibberish formula to be sung 'syððan sunne beo on setle,' and continues with a second formula: 'Lilumenne, æceð þæt ofer eall þonne alið; coliað, þonne hit on eorðan hatost byrneð.' Grendon translates 'it cools when on earth it burns most fiercely'—which I take to mean during the day when the sun is hottest. But 'coliað' is a rare and exclusively northern form in the singular, and a wish rather than a statement is here needed. I suggest the emendation 'colie ða ðonne,' 'let it cool,' with a different interpretation of the rest of the sentence. The tooth, which aches most 'ðonne alið,' burns against the earth when the sufferer lies down; 'Lilumenne' is invoked that it may 'cool,' cease aching, when at its worst. The words 'þæt' and 'hit' of course cannot represent 'toð';

[1] Possibly a spider, 'sympathetically' representing the dwarf, might be placed on a leaf and shipped out on a stream; and we should read in l. 11 'ongunn an him,' with 'ongunn' for 'ongann' (as in l. 13), 'spider wiht' as subject and 'him' referring to his 'boat'; but this is of course mere conjecture, and I venture it, in the cautious isolation of a footnote, only to show the direction in which I think the explanation is to be sought.

probably they are used with impersonal force; 'that aches, there is an aching'; 'when it burns, when there is a burning.'

IV. In the well-known *Siðgaldor* (G., H. 14; W., i, 328; Schlutter, *Anglia*, XXXI, p. 59 f.) the following lines have caused perplexity (ll. 23–5 in W., which I quote in preference to G. for this charm, as nearer to the MS.):

> Si me wuldres hyht
> hand ofer heafod, haligra rof,
> sigerofra sceote, soðfæstra engla.

I support Schlutter's interpretation of 'hand ofer heafod' as 'schützende hand'—indeed this was my independent conclusion—and his emendation 'sceole' for 'sceote.' Less satisfactory is his translation of 'rof' by 'zahl'; his supporting note offers no sufficient evidence. Does not 'rof' here probably stand for 'hrof,' as again in l. 28 ('leoht lifes rof')? The idea is that of protection, continuing 'hand ofer heafod'; we might translate 'a protecting cloud of saints.' A familiar variation of the same idea occurs in ll. 27–9.

Schlutter offers the following attractive explanation of the puzzling word 'circinde' (Windas gefran circinde wæter, l. 35 f.): 'ich nehme ein *circian* mit der bedeutung 'turn' an und ziehe das als k-ableitung zu cierran 'turn.'" This gives excellent sense: 'For I have knowledge of winds that keep the water in a turmoil.' (Schlutter has 'constant turmoil,' reading 'simble' with this phrase. This is metrically very awkward, and I prefer to close the sentence at the cæsura.) The only objection is that 'circian' does not occur anywhere else. As alternative, I suggest that we should read 'cercinde' from 'cercian,' 'cearcian,' to crash, gnash; used attributively, qualifying 'wæter,' which I take as accusative plural co-ordinate with 'windas' (for plural 'wæter' cf. Bosworth-Toller, II *b*). Read with a comma after 'gefran,' and translate 'I have heard of winds and roaring waters'—that is, the traveller has heard that storms and floods threaten him on his journey. Grendon's variant of Schlutter's translation scarcely needs consideration ('since the [savage] winds, I know, [beget] the whirling waters').

We turn to the concluding lines of the charm (38—42):

> Þæt ic on þes ælmihtian on his frið wunian mote,
> belocun wiþ þam laþan, se me lyfes eht,
> on engla bla blæd gestaþelod,
> and innan halre hand heofna rices blæd
> þa hwile þe ic on life wunian mote.

Editors have followed Cockayne in cancelling 'bla' in l. 40, without regard to the metrical faultiness of the resulting verse. I agree that

there is confusion through 'blæd,' but not that we have a mere duplication. I suggest

on engla blæd bliðe gestaþelod,

which normalizes the metre.

Difficulties remain in ll. 38 and 41; 'on þes ælmihtian on his frið' is very awkward, and l. 41 is inexplicable in regard both to sense and to syntax. Schlutter's explanation, though open to criticism, is the best yet offered. He transfers 'halre hand' from l. 41 to follow 'ælmihtian' in l. 38, thus supplying it with a governing substantive; translating this phrase 'in der retter-hand des allmächtigen,' and ll. 40 f. 'wenn ich gestellt bin in den schutz der engelschar und des himmlichen heeres.'

There are three objections to this arrangement. Firstly, it is most unsatisfactory metrically. Of course charm metres are frequently irregular, and Schlutter even prints this charm, without comment, in prose. I presume that his intention is merely to show that he is not concerned with the metre; for examination of any of the editions in which the charm is arranged in verses leaves no doubt that it is metrical, and that, though the alliteration is sometimes lax, the rules of stress are rarely broken. Schlutter's reading of l. 38 gives, in the first half-verse, an accumulation of stresses for which the rest of the charm affords no parallel. Secondly, 'innan heofna rices blæd' following 'on engla blæd' with only one half-verse between, is awkward and pointless, as Schlutter recognizes. Thirdly, the cæsura separates 'heofna' from its governing substantive 'rices'; and such separation is on the whole improbable, though this evidence alone would carry little weight in view of the 'learned' character of the charm (cf. Bohlen, *Zusammengehörige Wortgruppen getrennt durch Cäsur oder Versschluss*, etc., Berliner Dissertation, 1908). The rules of stress are again broken in the second half-verse; and (though this alone would count for nothing) the alliteration fails.

All these objections are met if we transfer 'blæd,' instead of 'halre hand,' to follow 'ælmihtian.' Schlutter's translations of 'blæd' ('schutz'), 'halre hand' ('retter-hand') and 'heofna rices' ('des himmelischen heeres') still serve. We thus read the whole passage:

Þæt ic on þes ælmihtian blæd, on his frið wunian mote,
belocun wiþ þam laþan, se me lyfes eht,
on engla blæd bliðe gestaþelod,
and innan halre hand heofna rices,
þa hwile þe ic on þis life wunian mote.

'So that I may remain under the protection of the Almighty and in His peace, guarded from the Enemy who seeks my life, blissfully

established under the protection of the angels and in the safe keeping of the heavenly host, while I am permitted to remain in this life.'

V. Custom seems now to be associating the charm *Wiþ feos lyre* (G., A. 15; C., iii. 286) with the rhythmical legal fragment beginning 'Hit becwæð and becwæl si ðe hit ahte' (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws, etc.*, p. 78; Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, i, 400). At least, Cockayne and the recent editors Macbryde and Grendon have printed them together, and the connection has not been challenged. Grendon states the case for this association (p. 222): 'Part I constitutes the actual charm for the recovery of the stolen property; Part II is a legal formula in which the rightful owner solemnly sets forth his title to the possessions in question. This rhythmical composition is printed separately in the various editions of the A. S. laws. It was attached to Part I probably because it was recited as a sort of oath by the person who claimed goods which were recovered from thieves, or which were in disputed ownership.'

To me this association seems mistaken. The legal fragment is associated with the charm only in two MSS., while the charm stands alone in three MSS. and the fragment stands alone in one MS. There seems to be no inner connection whatever between the two. The charm is for the recovery of stolen live-stock; the fragment cannot possibly apply to live-stock; its reference is solely and very definitely to land. Even in this connection I do not think it can be regarded as a general formula; it reads much more like a protest against wrongful dispute of title in some particular case, noted as a useful basis for other similar protests. The personal pronoun 'hine' (in l. 28 in G.: 'ðæt man cwydde oððon crafode hine on hundrede') refers to him who bequeathed the land, not, as Grendon supposes, to the protester; this is proved by comparison with the two following lines and the first line (G., ll. 29, 30, 12).

So far as I know, attention has never been called to the extraordinary form in which the fragment is written. It has been printed in the long verse, but this is certainly wrong. Of the twenty-three long verses into which Grendon divides the fragment only four are regular, two more might pass, and the rest are impossible. Of these remaining thirty-four short verses, seventeen have alliteration *concluded within the short verse*, three with assonance as well. Of those without alliteration, two have rhyme and one assonance within the half verse; and two half-verses in adjacent lines rhyme (31 II and 32 I). Twelve short verses remain with no ornament except occasional suffix-rhyme, and are often very questionable even in stress. If the fragment is metrical, we must

thus divide it into short verses (two stresses); but even then the stress presents many difficulties, and thirteen verses remain without any poetic link. I think it is better to regard the form as very rhetorical prose, borrowing verse rhythms and ornaments. Cases of highly alliterative prose occur elsewhere—e.g. in the Annals before Alfred, and in Wulfstan's Address to the English; but I know no other example where verse-rhythm also is so largely borrowed.

VI. Slight rearrangement would give much greater clearness to the charm *Wiþ ælfsogoðan* (G., A. 24; C. ii, 348; L. 106). The first ten lines give an introductory account of symptoms; the MS. arrangement, followed by the editions, then continues as follows:

Writ þis gewrit:
Scriptum est, rex regum et dominus dominantium · Byrnice · Beronice · lurlure · iehe · aius · aius · aius · Sanctus · Sanctus · Sanctus · dominus deus Sabaoth · amen · alleluiah.
Sing þis ofer þam drence and þam gewrite:
Deus omnipotens, pater domini nostri Jesu Cristi, per Inpositionem huius scriptura[e] expelle a famulo tuo, Nomen, Omnem Impetum castalidum de capite, de capillis, de cerebro, de fronte, etc. (the catalogue continues for some four lines more).
Wyrc þonne drenc: (prescription follows—some four lines). Nim þonne þæt gewrit, writ crucem mid ofer þam drince and sing þis þær ofer:
Deus omnipotens, pater domini nostri Jesu Cristi, per inpositionem huius scripturae et per gustum huius, expelle diabolum a famulo tuo, Nomen. And Credo and Paternoster.
Wæt þæt gewrit on þam drence and writ crucem mid him on ælcum lime, and cweð: Signum crucis Christi conservate. In vitam æternam, amen. (Three unimportant lines conclude the charm.)

I suggest that the passage '*sing þis ofer þam drence*,' down to the end of the prayer to be sung (ll. 5—9, above) is out of place, and should be transferred to follow the second prayer (that is to follow l. 14, above). The rearrangement gives the natural order: instructions for written charm; prescription for decoction; ceremonial association of charm and decoction, and general prayer over them together, with the indication that the decoction is to be swallowed; detailed prayer for the ceremonial 'impositio huius scripturae' which then immediately follows.

The order of the MS., it may be noted, has led Grendon into serious confusion; he translates l. 5 (G., l. 16) 'Sing this over the drink, and recite the following writing'; and again he expands l. 10 (G., l. 28) 'Then take the writing which was previously recited.' Of course 'gewrit' and 'scriptura' refer throughout to the gibberish charm ll. 2—4 (G., 12—14), which is the only writing named; and in l. 5 (G., 15) 'þam gewrite' is coördinate with 'þam drence.' In ll. 6 ff. (Deus omnipotens...to end of catalogue), as in ll. 12 ff. (Deus omnipotens...Paternoster), we have merely prayers, *sung* over the charm and the drink to sanctify them, and not written at all.

It may further be noted that the ceremonial directions are incomplete. The only instruction given for the use of the decoction is to moisten the written charm with it; but the phrase 'per gustum huius' (l. 13, G., 31) shows that some of it is to be swallowed. This is interesting as evidence that the ceremonial directions are not always given in full; and the omission suggests that some obscurities in the charms might vanish if the accompanying ceremonial were fully known (cf. § II and footnote).

VII. Of the many obscure passages in the *Nigon Wyrta Galdor* (G., B. 4; W., i, 320; H. Bradley, *Archiv* CXIII, 144) one or two may be attacked here.

The account of the fourth herb runs as follows:

> Fleoh þu nu, Attorlaðe, seo læsse ða maran,
> seo mare þa læssan, oððæt him beigra bot sy.

The passage has not been explained. Grendon translates 'Fly now, Betonica, the less from the greater, the greater from the less, until there be a remedy for both'; and remarks 'the passage is quite unintelligible.' I suggest that 'Fleoh' is transitive, meaning 'to put to flight, conquer' (Bosworth-Toller, fleon, II); 'seo læsse' and 'seo mare' are nom. sing. fem. agreeing with 'Attorlaðe'; 'ða maran' and 'þa læssan' acc. neut. plur. agreeing with 'attru' understood: 'Thou, Attorlade, conquer now the greater poisons, (though thou be) the lesser; thou, the mightier, conquer the lesser poisons; until the patient is cured of both (greater and lesser).' Some light is shed on the use of 'seo læsse' to describe 'Attorlaðe' by a passage quoted in Bosworth-Toller from the *Liber Medicinalis*, I, 45: 'Wið attre, betonican and *ða smalan attorlaðan* do on halig wæter[1].' For the personal application (*him*) of the passage, compare that on 'Mægðe,' four lines later ('ðæt næfre for gefloge feorh ne gesealde, syððan him mon mægðan to mete gegyrede'), also the last line of the charm, and the closing lines of the ceremonial directions.

Particularly interesting are ll. 31—35. I quote Wülker's text, as Grendon's emendation in l. 34 (æppel nædran attor) is unnecessary:

> Wyrm com snican, toslat he man.
> ða genam Woden viiii wuldortanas
> sloh ða þa næddran, þæt heo on viiii tofleah.
> þær geændade æppel ond attor,
> þæt heo næfre ne wolde on hus bugan.

[1] In our charm, Grendon translates Attorlaðe by Betonica. The use of 'betonican' and 'attorlaðan' in this prescription makes it improbable that they are identical. I do not know on what authority Grendon ignores the usual identification of 'attorlaðe' with the cock's spur grass (v. Bosworth-Toller), also called dew-grass and orchard-grass.

The difficulty lies in ll. 34–5. Wülker preserves the MS. reading, but assumes a gap between l. 34 and l. 35, because 'heo' is proved to be singular by 'wolde,' and therefore feminine, so that it cannot refer to 'æppel' or 'attor.' Hoops and Bradley both accept the MS. reading, and translate 'Apple and poison brought about that she [the adder] nevermore would enter house.' Grendon, remarking that 'this makes no sense,' emends as noted above, and translates 'there apple destroyed the serpent's poison, that it nevermore in house would dwell'—which forces an unsupported meaning upon 'geændade.' All these readings take 'and' as a conjunction. I suggest that it is the preposition, with the sense 'against' (v. Bosworth-Toller, II); and that 'geændade' means 'brought about,' 'accomplished' (as in l. 24, 'hwæt ðu geændadest æt Atorforda'), here used absolutely: 'There Apple accomplished (this) against poison—that she (the adder) would nevermore turn into [her] house'—that is, would never return to her nest, would perish.

Now to connect this with the three preceding lines. Comparison with the ceremonial directions following the charm shows that the aim of this passage is to glorify Apple as one of the nine 'herbs' (a convenient but loose translation). To Apple, then, 'wuldortanas' refers; the 'glory-twigs' with which Woden smites the serpents are apple-twigs. (Grendon's translation 'thunderbolts' apparently assumes, without attempting to support or explain, a confusion between Woden and Thunor, and need not be considered.) This may be noted as evidence that the apple-tree may have some claim to be numbered among the sacred trees. Apparently it was not one of those originally sacred among Teutonic races (cf. Grimm, cap. XXI); and this is natural, for a fruit tree would gain dignity only in an agricultural, not in a warlike civilization. But is it not possible that as Teutonic culture developed in peaceful directions, and its mythology changed complexion correspondingly, the Apple came to rank among the sacred trees? External influences may well have worked in this direction. Just as Mercury worship stimulated the worship of Woden, may not Pomona worship have exerted some influence in favour of the apple-tree? Lack of evidence makes this conjecture hazardous, and I venture to offer it only because every flicker of light shed on the dim detail of our mythology may help towards complete illumination.

A. R. SKEMP.

BRISTOL.

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE A-TEXT OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN.'

I. John Butt's Addition to the A-Text of 'Piers Plowman.'

Dr Henry Bradley, in the *Modern Language Review* for April, 1910, has called attention to the importance of the passage appended by one John Butt to the twelfth and last passus of the A-text of *Piers Plowman*. This passage was added during the reign of Richard II. Therefore it is, Dr Bradley points out, the earliest piece of external evidence which we possess as to the authorship of the poem. Nothing is known of John Butt, and we cannot gauge the accuracy of his information; his testimony therefore is only corroborative, not in itself conclusive, if unsupported. Yet everyone will probably agree with Dr Bradley's contention that it ought not to be rejected without consideration, and that it is worth spending some labour to ascertain, if we can, exactly what John Butt does say.

John Butt's addition is not always easily accessible, Professor Skeat having rejected it from his Clarendon Press edition. It seems better, therefore, to print the concluding lines of Passus XII in a note at the end of this paper, with some discussion as to what the exact limits of the passage added by John Butt may be. It is not, I fear, possible to ascertain with any certainty how many of the concluding lines are to be attributed to the original writer, and how many to John Butt. At least five theories are possible.

It would be helpful if we could decide this point; but fortunately such decision is not essential. What is important is the assertion that the seer of the visions, Will—

> wrought that which here is written and other works both,
> Of Piers the Plowman and much people also.
> And when this work was wrought, ere Will might espy
> Death dealt him a dint....

Clearly, everything turns upon the character of the manuscript to which these lines were first added. Only when we have decided that,

can we tell what is meant by 'that which here is written,' and what the 'other works' may have been which Will wrote in addition to 'that which here is written.'

John Butt's lines are found in MS. Rawlinson 137 *only*: this MS. contains a complete A-text. The *prima facie* interpretation of Butt's words is, then, that Will wrote the A-text as it lies before us in Rawlinson—and that he wrote other works on Piers Plowman as well. The obvious interpretation of the 'other works' would be that they are the only other works on Piers Plowman which we know to have been widely current when John Butt wrote: viz. the additional visions given in the B- or C-texts. John Butt's words should therefore be very comforting to those who are supporting the traditional view of one 'Long Will,' the author of all three texts. Oddly enough, Long Will's defenders have, up to the present, not availed themselves of John Butt's evidence.

Dr Bradley's interpretation of John Butt's lines is, however, different:

> Now, in the first place, I think the natural inference from his statement is that his lines were appended to a MS. containing only the poem of 'Dowel': that is to say A. IX—XII. He indicates that this poem was the last of the three works written by 'Will,' the others being *Piers the Plowman*, and *The Field of Folk* (*meckel puple*). When he had finished 'that which is here written' Will died. If John But was correctly informed, the poems contained in the A-text, though they are obviously intended to form a continuous whole, must have been published in three instalments, comprising respectively Passus I—V, VI—VIII, and IX—XII....It seems clear that he [John But] either did not know of the existence of the B and C texts or regarded them as spurious[1].

William Langland is on trial for his life: according to Prof. Manly he is already sentenced. The accused might submit that his trial has been somewhat of the kind approved by the King and Queen of Hearts in *Alice in Wonderland*: sentence before verdict, and verdict before evidence.

[1] Dr Bradley apparently takes 'this work,' the completion of which was followed by Will's death, as signifying 'this book,' and consequently as identical with 'that which is here written.' 'When he had finished "that which is here written,"' says Dr Bradley, 'Will died.'

But John Butt does *not* state that 'when he had finished "that which is here written," Will died.' What he says is that 'Will wrought that which here is written, and other works both, concerning Piers the Plowman and much people also. And when *this work* was wrought, Will died.' Surely in a fourteenth century poem, the expression 'this work' may be interpreted 'this task to which I have referred' (i.e. the writing down of 'what here is written' *and* the 'other works') with at least as much probability as 'this book which is here written' (to the exclusion of the 'other works'). The 'work' is the task which Will undertakes, in view of Fever's warning to address himself to 'prayers and profitable works.'

It is now five years since it was asserted that the acceptance in the B-text of certain textual derangements of the A-text proved that the author of the B-text could not be identical with the author of the A-text. Some students felt surprised when, on examining the alleged proof of these textual derangements, they found that no external evidence was put forward at all: that they were avowedly unsupported by a shred of MS. authority. Yet, notwithstanding this, the derangement of the A-text was widely, and for some time almost universally, treated as a demonstrated fact upon which further hypothesis could safely be based; while it is nothing more than an interesting thesis, in favour of which, and also against which, there is something to be said.

Then it was asserted that there were differences in dialect between the A- and B-texts which made it impossible to suppose their authors identical; and this assertion was made, not merely in publications where new and hazardous theories might legitimately be put forward, but in books like the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, which are supposed to speak with some measure both of authority and impartiality. Yet here again, only the thesis is forthcoming: for any demonstration of the thesis we are still waiting.

And now that a new argument against unity of authorship, based upon John Butt's words, is being brought forward, it rests again upon a thesis: that these words were appended originally to a MS. containing *Dowel* (Passus IX—XII) only. Obviously, if this should turn out to be so, then the interpretation given by Dr Bradley would be natural and indeed inevitable. The 'other works of Piers Plowman and much people also' would have to be Passus I—V and VI—VIII. Seeing that there would then be nothing which could be construed as a reference to the B- or C-text, although B was certainly published when Butt wrote, and possibly C also, it would appear, on Dr Bradley's assumption, that Butt's evidence tells against these being the work of 'Will,' the author of the A-text.

But believers in 'Long Will' will be entitled to ask Dr Bradley for some proof of this assumption that Butt's lines were originally added to a manuscript of *Dowel* only. Until proof is forthcoming they will be entitled to say, and to repeat, that John Butt's lines are actually found appended to a complete A-MS.: that, *in the absence of evidence to the contrary*, these lines were, presumably, originally added to a manuscript of a type similar to that in which they are extant, and that they therefore tell in favour of the theory that Will was the author of other works

on *Piers Plowman*, in addition to the A-text, and not against that theory. The burden of proof clearly rests with those who suppose that the lines were added to a manuscript of a type different from that in which we now find them. Meantime 'Long Will's' supporters are entitled to remain on the defensive, and strategically that is no doubt the securest course.

But the object of this paper is not either to attack or to defend 'Long Will.' To anyone engaged in the tedious but necessary task of trying to make out the relationship of the different A-MSS., it becomes necessary to collect whatever evidence is forthcoming as to the way in which the A-text was published. Dr Bradley's interpretation of John Butt's words involves a theory as to the manner in which the text was published which does not seem to be consistent with the phenomena of MS. types and relationships, so far as one can make these out. I shall try to show:

(1) That the A-text does not lend itself to a division into instalments.

(2) That, even assuming the publication in separate instalments, there are serious chronological objections to the view that the circulation in instalments was still prevalent in the reign of Richard II, when Butt added his lines.

(3) That, even granting circulation in instalments at that date, the evidence of MS. relationship is opposed to the view that Butt's lines were appended to a manuscript containing *Dowel* only. For this evidence seems to show conclusively:

(*a*) That the great majority of the A-text MSS. do not contain a twelfth passus, and that this deficiency cannot be attributed to the mutilation either of these manuscripts individually or of a common source; that therefore the twelfth passus must have been added as an afterthought, either by the poet himself or by someone else, to the original or originals of those few manuscripts in which it is found; and that, since John Butt's lines were added to a copy containing the twelfth passus, they must be either subsequent to or contemporary with the addition of that passus, but are certainly not earlier.

(*b*) That those MSS. which end at Passus XI, and those which contain the twelfth passus whether with or without Butt's lines, are descended ultimately from one original, and that this original contained *both* the *Vision* (Passus I—VIII) and *Dowel* (Passus IX, etc.), but did not contain the twelfth passus, still less John Butt's addition thereto.

(*c*) That the order of events must therefore have been *first* the combination of the instalments (granting the poem to have been published in instalments) into one text, and *subsequently* the addition of a twelfth passus and of John Butt's lines to a certain copy or to certain copies only of this combined text.

II. The Division of the A-Text into Sections.

Firstly, before entering into the complex questions of MS. relationships, does the text lend itself to division into sections so distinct as to allow of their having been issued separately?

For the view that Passus VI—VIII were published separately from Passus I—V there appears to be no support whatsoever in the text. They are integral parts of one and the same poem, the *Vision of Piers Plowman.* There is a much greater *prima facie* possibility that *Dowel* (IX—XII) was published separately from the *Vision,* for in all the best A-MSS. it is carefully distinguished from the *Vision* proper. At the end of Passus VIII most of the MSS. have, as we shall see, a note that 'here the *Vision* ends and *Dowel* begins.' Then the numbering of the passus begins afresh. Instead of IX, X, XI [XII] (a numbering too convenient to be now dropped, but one which is not authorized by any uncontaminated A-MS.) we have a prologue, and then Passus I, II [III] of *Dowel*[1].

This independent numbering of the passus of *Dowel* does not in the least prove separate publication. It does, however, suggest the possibility of it, and establishes a case for further scrutiny. But such scrutiny does not disclose any further evidence in favour of separate publication. On the contrary it shows the most intimate connection between the *Vision* and *Dowel.* The latter part of Passus VIII of the *Vision* is obviously intended simply to lead up to *Dowel.* Dowel, who has never before been mentioned, is referred to five times between VIII, 156 and VIII, 187. We are to do such works,

> Þat aftir oure deþ day Do-wel reherse
> Þat at þe day of dome we dede as he hiȝte[2].

Then the *Dowel* poem begins with an opening which certainly does

[1] MS. Douce 323 has, instead of Passus I of Dowel, 'Primus Passus in secundo libro.' On the other hand, both Douce and Harleian 3954 conclude the A-text, not *Explicit Dowel* but *Explicit liber petri plouman*; *explicit tractus de perys plowman.*

[2] Quotations from the A-text are given from MS. Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 3. 14.

not harmonize well with the theory that it was written for separate publication:

> Thus yrobid in rosset I rombide aboute
> Al a somer sesoun for to seke Do-wel.

These lines are a link, connecting *Dowel* with the preceding *Vision of Piers Plowman*. They have little meaning as the opening words of an independently published poem. To what does 'thus' refer if not to the preceding poem? And in fact 'yrobid in rosset' and 'al a somer sesoun' carry us back to the 'shroud' and the 'somer seson' of the opening of the *Vision*. 'Thus I roamed about to seek Dowel' carries us back to the conclusion of the *Vision* in which we are directed to Dowel as the one refuge against the judgment to come. This is surely a resumption of the subject at the beginning of a new section rather than the opening of an independently circulated poem.

But, according to Dr Bradley's interpretation of John Butt, not only was *Dowel* published separately from the *Visio*, but the *Visio* itself was published in two instalments, first Passus I—V, then Passus VI—VIII. In favour of this there appears, as we have seen, to be no evidence forthcoming. The difficulties, on the other hand, are greater even than those which meet us in postulating a separate publication of *Dowel*. For the opening of Passus VI is even more closely linked to the end of Passus V than is the opening of *Dowel* to Passus VIII. Had Passus VI—VIII been published in a separate instalment we might fairly expect the poet to begin: 'I have told before how I saw in a vision such and such things: I will now tell....' Instead of which Passus VI begins:

> Ac *þer*e was fewe men so wys *þat* þe wei[1] þid*er* coupe
> But blustrid forþ as bestis ou*er* valeis *and* hilles.
> Til late *and* longe *þat* hy a lede mette
> Ap*a*railid as a paynym in pilgrim wyse, etc.

Can this be the opening of an independently published poem?

It may be objected that the separately published instalments did not open exactly as the present Passus VI and Passus IX do: that the lines quoted above might have been links added by the man who bound the three instalments into one, so as to make them run together more smoothly. But this way of avoiding the difficulty is, on Dr Bradley's hypothesis, impossible. For, on that hypothesis, the A-text, as we have it in the Rawlinson MS., was produced by a binding together of the instalments *subsequent to* John Butt's addition, which addition was made

[1] þei, T.

in the reign of Richard II. But by general consent the B-reviser was at work earlier than this, in the year 1376–7. And the lines in question are also found in B. Features which are common to A and to B cannot possibly be attributed to a binding together of the separate instalments which is subsequent to B: they must have characterized those instalments which, on Dr Bradley's hypothesis, were the original form of the poem.

We should have, then, to believe that the poem was published in three instalments, the second and third of which began 'Few knew the way *thither*,' and '*Thus* robed in russet I roamed about.'

III. The Chronological Difficulty.

But, further, in order to make John Butt's 'what here is written' relate to *Dowel* only, Dr Bradley has to postulate that this circulation in instalments was still prevalent when John Butt wrote, in the reign of Richard II; that then, later, the three instalments were combined, and that hence John Butt's ending, originally intended to conclude *Dowel* only, came to stand at the end of the complete A-text.

Now there is a serious difficulty here. By general agreement Passus I—V, at least, had been written about 1362. John Butt wrote at least fifteen and possibly as much as thirty-seven years after 1362. That the poem was *then* being circulated in separate sections seems unlikely, in view of the fact that no trace of this separate circulation has been preserved[1].

This chronological difficulty does not admit of exact demonstration, but the more it is examined the more serious does it become. On Dr Bradley's hypothesis the different instalments in which the A-text

[1] Only one fact seems to be forthcoming at present which could be interpreted as a trace of separate circulation. Two MSS., Harleian 875 and Lincoln's Inn, break off, mutilated, shortly before the end of Passus VIII is reached. In view of the frequency with which the last leaf *only* is missing from a MS., it has been argued that these MSS. probably ended originally with Passus VIII, and that there was therefore probably a version of the poem published containing the *Vision* without *Dowel*.

If this argument could be sustained, it would tend to prove publication in instalments in the sense that the earlier passus might have been issued before the later: it would not however go to prove publication in instalments in the sense demanded by Dr Bradley's argument—viz. that the later passus, when published, were published separately, without the earlier passus preceding. But the argument cannot be sustained. Harl. 875 has indeed lost the last leaf of what is now its last section. But since Harl. 875 is apparently derived from the same archetype as Vernon, which has eleven passus, it is probable that a great deal more has been lost as well. Mr Grattan, who has collated the Lincoln's Inn MS., tells me that there is evidence that more than a single leaf has been lost there.

There is, then, no reason for thinking that either of these MSS. concluded with Passus VIII.

was published must, for at least half a generation, have been copied and scattered through the land, for we know that the poem was popular; then came B, who must have formed his text by putting the three instalments together, altering and expanding them as he did so; later still, perhaps even a score of years after the B-text was issued, came John Butt, who, finding the *Dowel* portion circulating independently, must have added his lines to it; then, later still, the three instalments must have been bound together into one poem, and the A-text as we know it in Rawlinson and the other kindred A-MSS. formed. This A-text was so popular that it was copied and re-copied almost as widely as the B- or C-texts, one or both of which must on Dr Bradley's hypothesis have been formed earlier. But we have to believe that the separate instalments, which had the start of *any* combined text by some fifteen years, have all been lost, whilst some fifty of the combined texts have been preserved. This surely is very difficult.

Nor can the difficulty be much reduced by arguing that, so soon as the complete A-text was in the field, scribes would cease to copy the separate instalments. A scribe had to copy what he could get, and few scribes had much choice. This is shown by the fact that the A-text, though only one-third of the B-text in bulk, was nearly as widely copied. Scribes either had not the fuller form to hand, or perhaps even in some cases preferred to copy the more brief and vigorous type. Precisely the same reasons which led scribes to copy the A-text after B had been issued would have led to the separate instalments of A, and particularly A I—V, being still copied, even after the complete A had been issued. Why is it then that no MS. is known containing A I—V, A VI—VIII, or *Dowel* separately?

IV. The Argument from the Relationship of the MSS.

It seems, then, exceedingly doubtful if we are justified in assuming, as Dr Bradley does, that *Dowel* was published separately, and was moreover being circulated in this separate form when John Butt wrote. But, assuming the independent *Dowel* MS. or MSS. to have existed then: is it possible that John Butt's lines were originally appended to a manuscript of this type?

Of course if John Butt's lines were found in every completed MS. of the A-text, it would be possible to assume that they were joined on to *Dowel* before *Dowel* itself was joined on to the *Vision*. But, as we

have seen, the lines are found in MS. Rawlinson Poet. 137 *only*. This MS. (R) is very closely related to two other MSS.: viz. U (Univ. Coll. Oxford, 45) and E (Trin. Coll. Dublin, D. 4. 12). These MSS. have inherited from the original from which they were all three copied a very large number of common peculiarities.

R and U both have a twelfth passus: in U this breaks off imperfect at l. 19; probably E also shared this peculiarity: but as E breaks off imperfect at VII, 45 we cannot be sure. Whether RUE all inherited John Butt's ending we cannot tell. Two leaves only have been lost from the end of U, but this would give ample room for the missing portion of Passus XII, and for John Butt's addition as well.

Only one other MS. contains a trace of the twelfth passus, viz. the Ingilby MS. (I) which gives that passus up to l. 88, where it suddenly ends. The Ingilby MS. therefore has no mention of John Butt. Its conclusion at l. 88 is apparently deliberate, as the MS. is not mutilated.

Let us now turn to the most important group of MSS., consisting of T (Trin. Coll. Camb., R. 3. 14), H_2 (Harl. 6041), Dig (Digby 145), W (Westminster), D (Douce 323). Here again we have a group intimately united, evidently derived from a common source. Within this group, T, H_2, Dig, W, make a sub-group, being derived from a MS. in which the scribe, realizing that there was more about Piers Plowman than was contained in the A-version before him, has joined on the later portion of the C-text.

The A-portion of the manuscripts TH_2DigW concludes at the end of Passus XI, with the lines:

> Souter*is* *and* seweris suche lewide iottis,
> Per*c*en wiþ a pat*er* noster þe paleis of heuene,
> Wiþoute pen*au*nce at here p*ar*tynge in-to heiȝe blisse.

This, alone, is not conclusive evidence that the A-MS., from which TH_2DigW are derived, ended there. It is possible, though unlikely[1], that the scribe, even though there was more in the A-MS. before him, might have broken off his transcription of the A-text at this line, because it afforded the most convenient point of juncture with the C-text.

But in Douce we have a MS. containing an A-text *only*, which is clearly derived from the same original from which the A-portion of

[1] Unlikely, because the scribe throughout abstains from any such attempt to harmonize A and C. The A portion of TH_2 is extraordinarily pure, and free from C influence. Apparently the scribe did not turn to his C-MS. till he had finished his transcription from A.

TH_2DigW is derived[1]. And Douce assures us that this A-text concludes with the end of Passus XI:

> Souters *and* sewers suche lewed Iottys
> Perceu *with* a pat*er* nost*er* þe paleys of heuene
> With-oute pen*a*unce at here partyng in-to heye blysse
>
> Now of þis litel book y haue makyd an ende
> Goddis blessyng mote he haue þat drinke wil me sende
>
> Explicit liber petri plouman.

The cry for drink and the large and triumphant letters in which *Explicit* is written, show the scribe rejoicing in the end of his toil. I refuse to believe that this worthy and thirsty soul had found a twelfth passus in his original, but, with deliberate mendacity, failed to transcribe it.

The tacit evidence of TH_2DigW, and the express assurance of D, make it clear, then, that the original of these MSS. ended with Passus XI. If it be argued that this was not a deliberate conclusion, but was due to the loss, in some way or other, of a twelfth passus from the archetypal MS. of TH_2DigWD, the fact has to be faced that other A-MSS., representing a tradition quite remote from that of TH_2DigWD, also end exactly at this point.

MS. Ashmole 1468 (As) concludes:

> Saweris *and* soweris sweche lewid iottis
> Mon p*er*syn w*ith* a pater n*oster* þe pales of heuyn
> W*ith*oute penauns at here p*ar*tyng into þe blisse of heuyn.
>
> Amen Amen
> Amen

The Ashmole MS. is of little value towards fixing the text, owing to the carelessness with which it has been copied, to its many lacunae, and to the fact that one or more of the scribes whose work it represents knew, and interpolated from, a B- or C-text. But none of these serious blemishes in the least invalidates its evidence as to the proper point where an A-MS. should stop. We want the evidence of a manuscript as remote as possible from the T group; and this evidence Ashmole gives, for it is unlike any other MS., and certainly has no special affinities with T.

MS. Harleian 3954 (H_3) gives an inaccurate version so corrupted in the earlier passus with B-influence, as to be worthless for the purpose

[1] Indeed Dig and W have been so defaced by corruption, and interpolation from B- and C-texts that the likeness between them and TH_2 is not nearly so obvious as between D and TH_2. W particularly is often extraordinarily unlike TH_2. But the argument in this paper would not be weakened, but slightly strengthened, even if it should be proved that W does not belong to the same group as TH_2, but was formed by an independent combination of an A-text with Passus XI—XXII of a C-text.

of fixing the A-text. But again this does not invalidate its evidence as to where the A-text should end. Mr Grattan and myself have so far been unable to trace any special affinities of Harleian 3954 to any other MS. or group of MSS. It is therefore an independent witness, and it agrees with TH_2DigW, with D and with As, in concluding:

> *With* a pa*ter* no*ster* to þe paleys of heuene
> *With* outy*n* gret penans at hys p*ar*tynge to comy*n* to blys.

Explicit tractus de perys plowman q. heru*n*; Qui cu*m* p*atre* *et* sp*iritu* s*ancto* viuit et regnat p*er* *omnia* *secula* *seculorum*. Amen.

How the VH group ended we do not know, as both Vernon and Harl. 875 break off imperfect, V in Passus XI, H in Passus VIII.

Of the ten MSS., therefore, which it is possible to call in as evidence of the way in which the A-text ended, seven, falling into three or four groups, point to the poem having ended with Passus XI; three MSS., falling into two groups, contain the whole, or portions, of a twelfth passus. But only one of these three contains John Butt's lines.

We are not free to assume that the absence of Passus XII from $TH_2DigWDAsH_3$ is due to mutilation, and this, not merely because the MSS. ending at Passus XI are seven, whilst those containing the whole or portion of a twelfth passus are only three: for a minority of MSS. might well retain an original feature. But the point is that the three MSS. containing the twelfth passus are more nearly connected with each other than are the seven which want it; the seven represent a great divergency of tradition. It is not difficult to understand how an added twelfth passus comes to be present in RUI: it would be very difficult to account for its having been lost from $TH_2DigWDAsH_3$. The same argument can be shown to apply *a fortiori* to the John Butt passage, present as it is in one MS. only, and wanting in eight. The poem, then, must originally have ended with Passus XI; the twelfth passus is an afterthought, added either by the poet himself or by someone else. This was the conclusion arrived at thirty-six years ago by Professor Skeat, and I do not see that any other is possible.

Again, since John Butt's lines were appended to a form of the poem containing the twelfth passus, they must have been added either at the same time as or later than the twelfth passus was added. But it can, I think, be proved that the copies to which this twelfth passus was added were copies of the complete poem, not merely of *Dowel*: the poem before this twelfth passus was added had already passed out of the stage of circulation in three separate instalments (assuming for the

sake of argument that such a stage ever existed) and was being circulated as one complete whole.

For the different groups of MSS. which we have been considering are themselves intimately related. The MS. from which RUE derive, which had the twelfth passus, and the MS. from which TH_2DigD derive, which certainly had not that passus, were themselves not distantly connected: they had a number of peculiarities in common, and were evidently derived in the last resort from one and the same prototype. But this prototype contained not only the *Vision of Piers Plowman* proper (Passus I—VIII) but also *Dowel* (Passus IX—XI). For the same Latin rubric, by which the *Dowel* poem is connected to the *Vision*, is inherited by RUTH_2DigD from their common prototype, in a common form, with only unessential variants:

(Explicit hic visio Willelmi de Petro Plouȝman: et hic incipit) Vita de Do-wel, Do-bet et Do-best secundum wyt et resoun.

Moreover, this peculiarly worded note is, so far as we can trace, common to all the A-MSS. H, L (Lincoln's Inn) and E break off before this point is reached. H_3 has no rubric here; I have not yet collated W up to this point, and, as the other members of the group to which W belongs are agreed, it appeared to be hardly worth while going to Eaton Hall to procure a reading which, in any case, would not materially influence the argument.

Of the rest all have a note: and, in it, all except the University College and the Vernon MSS. describe *Dowel* as the *Vita de dowel*: and all except Ashmole and Vernon further define it as *secundum wyt et resoun*. Now the usual title is either *Dowel* or the *Visio de Dowel*; I know of no other place than this in the A-, B- or C-texts either where the *Dowel* is called the *Vita*, or where it is explained as being *secundum wyt et resoun*: there *may* be instances, but they are certainly very exceptional[1].

Now it is not conceivable that this peculiar wording could have been hit upon by scribes, engaged independently in fitting together into one poem the hitherto separate instalments. It must be that those MSS. which possess either one or both of these peculiarities of

[1] Even in this place this particular wording is not usually followed in the B- and C-texts: in those few cases where it is found, it is clear that the scribes have copied it into the B- or C-text from their knowledge of an A-MS. E.g. in MS. Ll. 4. 14 in the University Library, Cambridge, we have at the end of the *Vision* 'Explicit visio Will*elmi* de petro plowman Et *sequitur* vita de dowell Dobett et Do-beste, sec*undum* wytt *et* reson': but this is in a later hand obviously borrowed from an A-text. MS. Bodl. 851 has 'Explicit vita *et* visio petri plowman,' which is probably an inaccurate recollection of an A-text; for MS. Bodl. 851 is a confused MS. written under the influence of A-, B-, and C-texts.

wording ($RUTH_2DigDIAs$) are derived from one original archetype in which this peculiarly worded note occurred, connecting the *Vision* with *Dowel*. Probably all our extant texts derive from this same archetype: but for everything that it is necessary to prove here, $RUTH_2DigDIAs$ are sufficient.

From the relationship of the extant MSS. of the A-text we are entitled then to draw the following conclusions:

(1) That the parent MS. from which $RUTH_2DigDIAs$ are derived contained both the *Vision* proper and *Dowel*, joined into one poem by a peculiarly worded Latin note which has survived in all its eight descendants.

(2) That John Butt's lines were *not* present in this MS. from which $RUTH_2DigDIAs$ are derived, since they are found in one of its descendants but are absent from the others.

(3) That John Butt must therefore have added his lines, later, to one of the transcripts of the parent MS.

(4) That the MS. to which John Butt's lines were added must like its original have contained both the *Vision* and *Dowel*, joined by the peculiarly worded note which it had inherited from the parent MS., and which R in turn inherited from it.

(5) That John Butt had therefore a complete A-text before him, and that when he speaks of 'what is here written' he must refer to the complete A-text.

These appear to be the results which legitimately follow from the known facts of MS. relationships. I do not deny that extraordinary complications, cross-copying, and contamination, often throw us out of our reckoning, and that the most legitimately drawn conclusions *may* be wrong. Thus it is *conceivable* that the John Butt passage has no business where it is found, in MS. Rawlinson 137, at all, and that therefore the conclusions legitimately drawn from its presence there are misleading. Assuming for the sake of argument that there were manuscripts containing *Dowel* only, it would not be inconceivable that the Butt passage was originally added to a manuscript of this type, and that it was not present in the parent of the Rawlinson MS. at all: that the scribe who wrote the Rawlinson MS. knew the *Dowel* MS. and inserted the passage from it into his Rawlinson: that then the *Dowel* MS. was lost, and a puzzle thus left to mislead future students. Such things do happen. Take, for example, the new lines of Juvenal discovered in the

Oxford MS. some eleven years ago. They had no business in a manuscript of the type of that in which they were found: and the best way of accounting for them is by supposing that the scribe who wrote this MS. had access not only to the comparatively commonplace MS. which he copied, but also to a very ancient MS. of another type, all trace of which has now disappeared: that at this point he turned from his copy, and inserted these lines from the more ancient MS., and thus produced a text which, whilst quite ordinary in its other features, preserves lines not known in any MS. of its own, or indeed of any other, family.

There is always the remote possibility of some extraordinary cross copying: and in the case of the Juvenal MS. the phenomena of the text have compelled many, if not most scholars, to assume that such cross copying has taken place[1].

But in the case of the Butt passage we have no tittle of evidence to lead us to suppose that this has happened. The obvious fact is that we find the lines in MS. Rawlinson 137. There is a remote possibility that they might have been interpolated there from some other MS. of a quite different type: but in the absence of evidence for this we must base our theories upon the obvious fact, and not upon the remote possibility.

V. The 'Other Works.'

Dr Bradley's theory has, I submit, to meet and successively overcome three obstacles: firstly, that the form in which the second and third of the postulated instalments open, does not suggest independent publication, but the reverse: secondly, that if our extant A-text was put together from such instalments as late as the reign of Richard II, we might reasonably expect very considerable traces of such instalments to have survived: and thirdly that, even assuming the independent *Dowel* in the time of Richard II, the known facts of MS. relationship would not allow us to suppose that John Butt's lines were added to it, except by postulating cross copying of a most extraordinary character. Unless we postulate such cross copying I cannot see how we can avoid the conclusion that John Butt's lines were added to a complete A-text.

Still less do I see why we should wish to avoid this conclusion. For even if we had not the evidence of MS. relationships, the most straightforward interpretation of John Butt's statement, that Will wrote 'what here is written,' would be that he wrote what lies before

[1] See the *Classical Review*, xvii, 394; *Gött. gel. Anzeiger*, 1899, p. 895.

us written in the MS., where we find the lines, 'Will wrought what here is written [i.e. the A-text] and other works both concerning Piers the Plowman and much people also. And when this labour was concluded, he died.'

The only other works concerning Piers Plowman which we know to have been extant when Butt wrote, in the reign of Richard II, are (1) the bulky additions forming Passus XI—XX of the B-text; and, towards the end of the reign, (2) the same in revised form forming Passus XIII—XXIII of the C-text, and (3) the *Crede*.

Now the essential characteristic of the B-additions to the poem is the prominent part which Piers the Plowman plays in them. In the original *Dowel* Piers the Plowman is never so much as mentioned. We have seen that, although the opening of *Dowel* assumes that *Piers Plowman* precedes, the author did not regard *Dowel* as part of the *Vision of Piers Plowman*. For he called its sections i, ii of *Dowel, not* x, xi of the *Vision of Piers Plowman*. But when we come to the B-text it is different. Here the formula is 'Passus nonus (decimus) de visione, et primus (secundus) de Dowel.' And this difference in title corresponds to a difference in the subject matter of *Dowel* in the B-text compared with *Dowel* in A. The search for Dowel as we have it in A passes in B into a search for Piers Plowman. Not all at once. We have Imaginative: then the dinner in which Conscience, Clergy, Patience, Reason, Will and the doctor sit down together; then Hawkyn the active man—and here for the first time Piers is again mentioned (XIII, 237). More and more frequent become the references to Piers and to the help which he alone can give (XV, 190, 193, 206: XVI, 18). At the last mention:

> Piers þe plowman! q*uo*d I þo, and al for pure ioye
> Þat I herde nempne his name anone I swouned after
> And laye longe in a lone dreme.

Piers himself comes to the dreamer:

> And atte laste me þou3te
> Þat Pieres þe plowman al þe place me shewed.

From this point Piers is the poet's theme, for the remaining nineteen hundred lines of the Vision. Piers vanishes:

> And I awaked *þere*-with *and* wyped myne eyghen
> And after piers þe plowman pryed aud stared.
> Estwarde and westwarde I awayted after faste
> And 3ede forth as an ydiote in contre to aspye
> After Pieres þe plowman many a place I sou3te.
>
> (XVI, 167—171.)

The search for Piers Plowman—faithful, humble and laborious humanity, for the time identified with that perfect manhood in which the Son of God clothed himself—culminates in the eighteenth passus, which Skeat has finely named 'The Vision of the Triumph of Piers the Plowman': the story of how the Saviour clad 'in Piers armes in his helme and in his haberioun' overcame death. But from the point where the dreamer awakes, with the Easter bells ringing in his ears, we have a return to the earlier conception of Piers 'the ideal of conduct' labouring to build up the Church. But Piers' work is attacked by Pride, Covetousness, Sloth, Flattery, and laid waste, for all that Conscience can do: and Conscience becomes a pilgrim to

> walken as wyde as al þe worlde lasteth
> To seke Piers þe plowman.

Now *we* may call all this 'the B-addition': but that is not the language of the fourteenth century. I do not know that John Butt could have described these extraordinary visions much better than in the words he has used—'other works concerning Piers the Plowman and much people also.' He could not have described them as the *Vision of Dowel, Dobet and Dobest,* for that name belongs equally to Passus IX—XII of the A-text, from which he is seeking to distinguish the 'other works.'

The interpretation of 'what is here written' as the A-text and the 'other works' as the B-additions presents, then, no difficulties: whilst Dr Bradley's interpretation of 'what is here written' as *Dowel* and the 'other works' as the *Vision* is open to the objections that it forces us to assume a type of MS.—an independent *Dowel*—for the existence of which we have no evidence, and to assume that John Butt's lines were added to a MS. of this type, and that *Dowel* with this addition was subsequently combined with the *Vision,* though the legitimate conclusion from the evidence appears to be the contrary[1].

[1] Some slight corroboration of the view expressed above may perhaps be drawn from the following considerations:

(1) John Butt 'saw these saws busily alleged by James, Jerome and Job.' Jerome, so far as I know, is never quoted in A or B, though he is alluded to in B XIX, 265. If Butt had the A-text before him, he would have seen saws alleged from James and Job: if *Dowel,* then from Job only. Dr Bradley's contention is that we ought not, without proof, to assume John Butt to be talking rubbish; and to assume that he had an A-text before him makes better sense of his talk than to assume *Dowel* only.

(2) The supposition that Butt's lines were added to the lost archetype of RUE agrees excellently with the chronological data. R and U belong to the early fifteenth century: the lost archetype, intermediate between this period and the first publication of the A-text about 1362 would probably belong to the reign of Richard II: and John Butt, as we know, wrote in that reign.

(3) The fact that there were several different versions of Piers Plowman was much better understood in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries than has generally

John Butt's statement then amounts to this:

(1) That Will, so far from being 'a creation of the Muse' wrote 'what here is written' in MS. Rawlinson 137: viz. the complete A-text: that he also wrote 'other works concerning Piers the Plowman,' which, so far as our knowledge goes, can best be explained as the B-additions. In both these assertions John Butt confirms, and is confirmed by, tradition.

(2) That Will was already dead in the reign of Richard II: he cannot, therefore, be the author of *Richard the Redeless* (*Mum Sothsegger*). Here again John Butt is in harmony with tradition, as this poem was first attributed to Langland in the nineteenth century.

In conclusion I have to thank Dr Bradley for having read through this paper in an earlier draft, and for having suggested modifications which add greatly to any force the arguments may carry. I have also to thank Mr Grattan for his criticism, and for certain MS. readings with which he has supplied me.

APPENDIX.

The Extent of John Butt's Addition.

It is exceedingly difficult to say where John Butt's lines begin. For in none of the A-MSS. does the A-text attain to anything that can be regarded as a satisfactory or final conclusion.

We have seen that most MSS. end with Passus XI. But this can never have been intended for anything more than a temporary halting place. True, the words 'parting,' 'bliss of heaven' strike a note common in conclusions. But it is not possible that the poet can have meant the poem to close here. Will has been sent, in his search for Dowell, to Clergy and Scripture, representing different forms of learning. To them he roundly expresses his conviction that learning is idle. Man's lot is predestined: the most learned, Solomon and Aristotle, are damned: Clergy was never commended by Christ's mouth: Austin, the most learned doctor, commended the unlearned rather than great clerks.

been supposed. We have seen that the scribe of the lost MS. from which TH_2DigW derive, when he had got to the end of his A-text, turned to a C-text and added the matter which he found there. T is a very early MS., and has even been attributed by Dr M. R. James to the fourteenth century. The common ancestor being older, belongs almost certainly to the reign of Richard II. We can, then, point to a scribe in the reign of Richard II who, having an A-MS. before him, clearly understood that besides 'what was there written' there were 'other works' concerning Piers the Plowman: and proceeded to add them. We have in this an excellent precedent for the interpretation of John Butt's words given above.

Now all this is obviously meant to lead up to a reply, by or on behalf of Clergy and Scripture, such as we get in the B-text[1]. It must have been intended from the first that the other side of the case should be put. Meantime the poem was issued in a form concluding with Passus XI.

To some copies, as we have seen, a twelfth passus was added: but this is not satisfactory. The poet is reproached for his disrespectful words, but no attempt is made to refute them. 'I have done my devoir,' says Clergy, 'to teach thee Dowel...and if I knew that thou wouldest work accordingly I would answer all thy questions.' But Clergy does not answer Will's furious onslaught. He hardly seems to have heard it. Scripture scornfully bids Clergy answer the questioner no further, for he came not in order 'to lerne to Dowel.' But Scripture also does not answer Will's objections. She merely bids her helpmeet be still, exactly as in Passus XI Dame Study had commanded her husband Wit to tell the poet no more. Clergy is as much under the control of his wife as Wit had been. Wit had become confounded, could say no more, and drew him aside: Clergy creeps into a cabin, draws the door after him and bids Will do well, or evil if he will, whichever he likes. The poet appeals to Dame Scripture just as before he had appealed to Dame Study, promising in each case 'to be her man.' In each case the shrew relents and directs the poet to her cousin, who is to teach him more. In the last case the cousin is Kind Wit, who is lodging with Life; Scripture called a young clerk *Omnia probate* who is to lead Will to the borough *Quod bonum est tenete* where Kind Wit dwells, and bid Kind Wit show Dowel to Will. So they set out together.

It is at this point that Prof. Manly supposes John Butt to have begun. He points out, with justice, that John Butt's words, 'for he medleth of making he made this end' imply an addition of some length, something more than the twelve or nineteen lines which Skeat would allow.

But the whole twelfth passus is quite short: including Butt's undoubted addition it contains only 112 lines. Why may not the whole of it be John Butt's end? Butt was clearly a person of no great ability, who possessed the knack of writing tolerable alliterative verse. The lines summarized above (XII, 1—54), with their strongly imitative

[1] The manner in which the end of the A-text leads up to the beginning of the B-text is one of the arguments in favour of unity of authorship. On this point the most interesting and able article by Dr Otto Mensendieck in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, IX, 404 ff., should be consulted.

cast, are what we might expect from such a writer. There is no chronological difficulty; for the fact that there is a phrase and an idea common to this twelfth passus of A and to the B-text, does not prove it earlier than B[1]. It would be conceivable that Butt put together this twelfth passus from one or two vague recollections of the B-continuation and by more deliberate borrowing from the eleventh passus of A, which lay before him.

If however we are to attribute the twelfth passus in part to the author of *Dowel* and in part to John Butt it is difficult to know where to make the division. At least four places are possible. Professor Manly makes John Butt begin at l. 55, where Will and Kind Wit set out together. Another change is, I think, indicated at l. 89. Prof. Skeat has suggested l. 99, 'Wille wiste thurgh in-wit.' Originally Prof. Skeat suggested l. 106, 'And so bad Iohan but.'

If Prof. Manly is right, the passus must originally have broken off imperfect; for l. 54, so far from concluding anything, marks the beginning of another adventure, Will's visit to Kind Wit and Life. This is, of course, no argument against Prof. Manly's view; presumably the end *was* abrupt, or John Butt would not have felt it necessary to round it off by adding his lines. In seeking the place where the original Passus XII left off we are not justified in demanding that it shall make a satisfactory conclusion to the A-text.

John Butt certainly managed to imitate the style of his original fairly well: very well, if he wrote all that Prof. Manly attributes to him; and it is not easy to find differences in language and metre which will enable us to decide exactly where his addition begins.

A study of the subject-matter may be more helpful. Line 55, where Prof. Manly supposes John Butt to begin, shows us *Omnia probate* and Will setting out together to seek Kind Wit. But before Will reached his journey's end, he met with many marvels. First he was greeted by Hunger, who like himself, was on the way to find Life: 'though Kind Wit help, I shall fell that freke in a few days.' 'I would follow thee,' said Will, and Hunger consented; but Will ate so much of Hunger's broken scraps that he lagged behind, and was hailed by Fever—'a knave with a confessor's face, lean and wretched, with legs full small.' Fever, too, was on the way to Life, bearing a message from his Duke, Death.

[1] If, with Dr Mensendieck, we interpret B XI, 414, as a reference to A XII, 35, etc., then clearly this opening of the twelfth passus of A must be earlier than the B-text. But the reference may, I think, be to B XI, 404—5.

I am masag*er* of deþ · men haue I tweyne
Þat on is called Cotidi*an* · a co*urr*our of our*e* hous
Tercian þ*at* o*þer* · trewe drinker*es* bo*þe*.
We han lette*res* of lyf · he shal his lyf ty[n]e
Fro deþ þ*at* is our*e* duk · swyche dedis we brynge.

'If I might,' said Will, 'I would follow in thy track.'

'Nay, Will,' said Fever, 'thou fallest into a snare if thou followest me; so live and work according to Dowel, that thou mayest reach Paradise at last.' Will knew that these were profitable words, so he made haste and wrought what is written here, and other works concerning Piers the Plowman and much people also: and when this work was wrought, Death dealt him a dint, and drove him to the earth, and he is closed under clay: Christ have his soul. And so John Butt prayed, when he saw these saws quoted concerning James, Jerome and Job; and because he is something of a poet he made this ending. Now God save King Richard and the lords who love him: Mary pray for us: Christ save us. Amen.

Where Fever dismisses the poet, an essential change comes over the story of the search for Dowel. The subject of Dowel was first introduced when, at the end of Passus VIII, the poet saw in Dowel the one help in that judgment which must follow death. Through four passus Will, in his search for Dowel, has been sent from one allegorical character to another, has received much good advice, but has got no nearer his goal: and now when he is hastening to seek Dowel at the dwelling of Life, and is passed on the way by Hunger and Fever, who are also seeking Life, we seem to be leading up to a conclusion which shall emphasize the familiar moral, how, faced by death and judgment, Life can find support and consolation in nothing but Dowel, his good deeds. Kind Wit will not help him, Hunger says as much: but we should expect to learn how, dwelling in the burgh of *quod bonum est tenete*, and knowing Dowel familiarly, Life has nothing to fear from Hunger, Fever, or Death.

Suddenly, when Fever turns the poet aside from his quest, all is changed. At this point the subject of the poem ceases to be Will's search for Dowel, or the struggle between Life and Death, and is directed to the personality of Will himself—his writings, his death, the prayer for his soul.

The matter does not, of course, admit of proof: but the point where John Butt takes up his pen is surely very likely to be identical with that where the reader's thoughts are thus suddenly, and with some violence, diverted from the search for Dowel to the fate of Will.

Now it is precisely at this point that the Ingilby MS. stops. Where

our third authority for this twelfth passus, the University College MS., may have ended, we do not know, as, owing to a mutilation, it breaks off quite near the beginning of the passus. The Ingilby MS., however, is *not* mutilated: the scribe has left the last written page blank all but one line: two subsequent leaves have been nearly all torn out, but they clearly contained no more of the story of Dowel. The Ingilby scribe must have stopped at this line because his copy stopped[1]. Of course his copy may have been mutilated: but it would be an odd coincidence that it should have been mutilated just at the very line where there is a break in the thought in the Rawlinson MS. so marked as to lead us to conjecture that the original poem may have stopped there. It is a far easier hypothesis to suppose that the original poet stopped where Ingilby makes him stop[1], and that those lines which are found in Rawlinson but are not found in Ingilby (viz. 89—117) constitute John Butt's addition.

At the same time it must be remembered that this is only a probability: it does not admit of demonstration.

There is, however, also a clear break in the continuity at l. 99, and again at l. 106. Prof. Skeat's original view, that John Butt's lines begin 'And so bad John Butt,' and that the preceding lines, in which Will is killed off, are not John Butt's at all, has still some supporters.

Five points have been indicated where it is conceivable that the original poet stopped. Diligent search would probably reveal five more. Such theories, unless backed up by some external evidence, are not usually convincing. The only places for which we have MS. authority for stopping are at the end of Passus XI, or at XII, 88. For this reason, unless strong evidence is forthcoming, I should be inclined to believe either that Butt wrote the whole of Passus XII, or that he wrote only from l. 89 onwards.

The text of the twelfth passus, from the point where Ingilby stops, is given below, from Rawlinson.

'Nay, wil!' quod þat wyȝth · 'wend þou no ferther
But lyue as þis lyf · is ordeyned for the:
þe tomblest wiþ a trepget · ȝif þou my tras folwe
And mannes merþe wrouȝþ no mor · þan he deseruyþ here
Whil his lyf and his lykhame · lesten togedere.

[1] Ingilby simply stops: no *Explicit* is added. But, as pointed out above, this abrupt ending cannot be used as an argument that something has been lost. Presumably John Butt found the twelfth passus abrupt.

And þer-fore do after do-wel · whil þi dayes duren
þat þi play be plentevous · in paradys with aungelys.
þou shalt be lauȝth into lyȝth · with loking of an eye
So þat þou werke þe word · þat holy wryt techeþ
And be prest to preyeres · and profitable werkes.
Wille [wiste] þurgh in-wit · þou wost wel þe soþe,
þat þis speche was spedelich · and sped him wel faste,
And wrouȝthe þat here is wryten · and oþer werkes boþe
Of peres þe plowman · and mechel puple al-so;
And whan þis werk was wrouȝt · ere wille myȝte a-spie,
Deþ delt him a dent · and drof him to þe erþe,
And is closed vnder clom · crist haue his soule.
And so bad Iohan but · busily wel ofte,
When he saw þes sawes · busyly a-legged
By Iames and by Ierom · by Iop and by oþere,
And for he medleþ of makyng · he made þis ende.
Now alle kenne creatures · þat cristene were euere,
God for his goudnesse · gif hem swyche happes,
To lyue as þat lord lykyþ · þat lyf in hem putte.
Furst to rekne Richard · kyng of þis rewme,
And alle lordes þat louyn him · lely in herte,
God saue hem sound · by se and by land;
Marie moder and may · for man þou by-seke;
þat barn bryng vs to blys · þat bled vp-on þe rode!
Amen.

Explicit do-Wel.
Nomen scriptoris tilot plenus amoris.

R. W. Chambers.

London.

SOME UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF DRUMMOND FROM THE HAWTHORNDEN MSS.

For the purposes of the present article the poems of Drummond of Hawthornden may be conveniently divided into those published by himself during his lifetime, and those which at different times were made public after his death, which took place in 1649. The latter, exclusively, concern us here.

A few years after the poet's death the publication of his works was undertaken at the instance, it would appear, of his brother-in-law, Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet. At any rate in 1655 there appeared a volume containing his chief prose work, the History of the Five Jameses, together with several prose tracts, a selection of twenty-two *Familiar Epistles*, and his essay, *A Cypress Grove*. This was followed up the year after by a collected edition of his *Poems*, with a preface by Edward Philipps, Milton's nephew. This edition contains most of the poems previously published, with the addition of about sixty new pieces, two of which are certainly not by Drummond. Both the volume of 1655 and that of 1656 exist in copies bearing a dedication to Scotstarvet. Although there is no evidence in the shape of a statement by Philipps to that effect, or any other equivalent record extant, it is manifest from the considerable amount of new matter published for the first time by Philipps, that he must have had access to certain manuscripts of Drummond. What these were it is hardly possible, in the light of our present knowledge, to ascertain. We may conclude that the manuscripts at Philipps' disposal were probably much less extensive and much less important than those utilised by subsequent editors, even if we admit, as we readily do admit, that Philipps carried out his undertaking in a very unsatisfactory fashion. In any case, it was well known at the time that many of Drummond's poems were still unpublished; and we find Lord Strathallan, in his manuscript *History of the Family*

of Drummond (1681), recording the fact that many of his pieces were still lying in manuscript. No fresh attempt was made to publish a more complete edition of Drummond's works till 1711, when the Edinburgh printer James Watson issued from his presses what is generally known as the 'Folio Edition' under the title 'The Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden. Consisting of Those which were formerly printed, and Those which were design'd for the Press. Now published from the Author's original Copies.' This edition, apart from considerable additional matter in prose, contains about forty new poems (a few of them of doubtful authenticity), and generally shows more careful collation of the pieces previously printed. In the preface the editor, who does not reveal his identity, states expressly that he was favoured by Sir William Drummond of Hawthornden, the poet's son, 'with an excellent Manuscript by the Help of which he was able to correct a great many Errors, and supply a great many Defects, as may be easily seen by any one, who will give himself the Pains to compare this with the former Editions.' In another passage of the Preface the editor states that he has been careful to communicate from the manuscripts everything of importance, with the exception of such papers as were considered to be 'imperfect or juvenile essays,' and which 'it may be supposed,' he adds, 'our Author never designed, and we thought not fit, for the press.' There appears to be some uncertainty as to who the editor of this edition of 1711 was. It is now generally admitted that two persons and not one were concerned in carrying the work through the press; and that these two persons were Thomas Ruddiman, the learned grammarian, and Bishop Sage, who was also responsible for 'The Life of William Drummond of Hawthornden,' which comes immediately after the Preface. Presumably the manuscripts lent to Ruddiman by Drummond's son were duly returned, and lay undisturbed in the family library until the Reverend William Abernethy Drummond of Hawthornden, an indirect descendant of the poet, in the year 1782, presented to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland the 'whole manuscripts,' so read the Minutes of the Society, 'of the celebrated Historian and Poet William Drummond of Hawthornden,' containing, besides other matter, transcripts of most of Drummond's prose works, and of some of his poems; various letters; extracts from other Authors, both in prose and verse, in the poet's own handwriting. Forty-five years later these manuscripts, which during all the years they had remained in the Society's keeping had been allowed to lie in bundles or in loose sheets without being sorted or arranged in any way, were carefully examined

and arranged in fifteen bound volumes by Mr David Laing. The same distinguished antiquary published 'A Brief Account of the Hawthornden Manuscripts in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland; with Extracts, containing several unpublished Letters and Poems of William Drummond of Hawthornden,' in the fourth volume (1831) of the *Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.* Leaving out of account the prose works as not concerning us here, Laing's paper contains about ten sonnets, fourteen madrigals, and a large number of epigrams which had never been previously printed in any of the editions of Drummond's works—a considerable addition to the poetic store of the Laird of Hawthornden, although very few of the pieces can be said to add to his reputation as a poet, or to reveal any new aspect of his talent; and the bulk of the shorter pieces (epigrams principally) possess no literary value, however interesting some of them may be for the history of the troublous times in which Drummond lived. Since Laing's publication, all the pieces discovered by him have been incorporated in subsequent editions of Drummond's Poems, of which the only two of any value are that of the Maitland Club (1832), and the comparatively recent one by W. C. Ward (1894), which is especially noteworthy as being the first edition in which any attempt is made to trace the Scottish poet's sources.

Having projected a critical edition of Drummond's poems, it had been my intention for some time past to investigate the Hawthornden manuscripts afresh on my own account, but various circumstances prevented me from carrying out my undertaking till quite recently. The result of a careful examination of the manuscripts was two-fold; it showed that by their aid many important corrections could be made in the poems already printed, especially in those published for the first time by Philipps (whose inaccuracy has often been suspected, but never really exposed); and it further revealed the fact that the Hawthornden manuscripts in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland contain a number of pieces by Drummond which escaped the attention of Laing, and which are, in part at all events, quite as worthy of Drummond, and therefore of publication, as those communicated by Laing in his above-mentioned paper. It is possible that they may not have escaped the attention of the learned antiquary, but that he may have been repelled by the extraordinarily bad hand in which most of them are written.

The question may well be asked whether the pieces printed here for the first time, such as they appear in the manuscripts, stand in their

final form; and whether Drummond ever meant them to face the light of day. To the first question no certain reply can be given; we must be content with the observation that the poems in question, in spite of the bad handwriting, figure in the manuscripts with hardly any erasures or emendations. This circumstance goes to prove that they are clean copies, and not merely unfinished essays. No more affirmative answer can be given to the second question; yet it would be unjustifiable to conclude, because Drummond did not commit certain poems to the press, that he deemed them unworthy of his reputation: subsequently to the first edition of the *Flowers of Sion*, which appeared in 1630, Drummond wrote very little verse, being too much occupied with various political prose tracts and his History of the Five Jameses to be able to devote much time to the gentler art of poetry, which he probably only cultivated in his spare moments for the sake of recreation, believing that he had produced sufficient verse of a high order to secure the perpetuation of his name as a poet. If our surmise be correct, the miscellaneous verse published after his death at various times, including that here communicated, would represent odd poems composed in vacant hours during the last twenty years of his life, insufficient in number and too varied in character to furnish the material for a new publication.

Drummond was so widely read in native as well as foreign literature, and so accustomed to transcribe passages or entire poems from all kinds of authors, that of the unpublished pieces here selected one or two may be found to which the Scottish poet has no better claim than that of being an amanuensis. Precautions have been taken to preclude any such contingency by consulting friends who are better versed than myself in the history of English poetry. In spite of this precaution, it is conceivable, though unlikely I think, that an odd piece may have crept into the list which does not belong to Drummond.

Before concluding these remarks, it ought to be stated that those printed below only represent a selection from the unpublished poems of Drummond. It is hoped that they may be followed before long by another batch. Most of the pieces occur in Vol. x of the Hawthornden MSS. as arranged by Laing, but Vols. vii and viii also contain a few worth reproduction.

The first sonnet is entitled by Drummond 'A lady weeping.' It is also copied on p. 67 of the same volume of the Hawthornden manuscripts with a few variants, such as *comd* for *come* (v. 13), and *semes* for *seemst* (v. 14):

Ah! eyes, deare eyes, how could the Heauens consent
To giue to you occasion of those teares?
Brest, sugred Brest that globes of Beautie beares,
With sighes why should ye swell—with tears be sprent?
Hair, that in spight of grief art excellent,
What haue you done? That hand you wronglie teares;
Voice, through dear portes of pearle and rubies sent,
Why should you moan? mor fit to tune Heauens spheares.
Foule Grief, the scourge of life, from Heauen exild,
Child of Mishap, the Hells extreme disgrace,
Brother to paine, Mans weaknesse, foster child,
How did you mount to so diuine a place?
Yet Grief, come there, so stranglie she thee furms,
That thou seemst Joy, while she thus sweetlie murns.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 3.)

Another sonnet of considerable merit is addressed to Lady Mary Wroath:

For beautye onlye, armd with outward grace,
I scorne to yeeld, to conquerre, or to striue.
Let shallow thoughtes that can no deeper dyue,
As fits there weaknesse, rest upon a face.
But when rare partes a heunlye shape confines,
Scarce reacht by thoughtes, not subiect to the sight,
Yet but the lanterne of a greater light,
Wher worth accomplisht crownd with glorie shines,
Then when bright vertue raignes in beautyes throne,
And doth the hart by spirituall magick moue,
Whilst reasone leads though passiones follow Loue,
Lothd may hee be that likes not such a one.
If it not lou'd so brave a Mynd thus shown,
I hated had the basenesse of myne own.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 81.)

It is preceded in the manuscript by these stanzas, which elaborate the same theme:

Who can (great Lady) but adore thy name,
To which the sacred band are bound to bow.
Of men your uncle first, of woemen yow,
Both grace this age, and it to both giues fame.

Your spacious thoughts, with choice inuentiones free,
Show passiones power, affectiones severall straines;
And yet one sort, and that most rare remaines,
Not told by you, but to be proud of mee.

No face at all could haue my hart subdued,
Though beautyes Sunne in the Meridian shind;
Yet by the glorye lightning from a Mind,
I am her captive whom I neuer knew.

Sprightes wanting bodyes are not barrd from loue,
But feele, not touching; see, though wanting eyes;
Aboue grosse senses reach true vertue flyes,
And doth by sympathye effectuall proue.

Then wonder not to see this flame burst foorth,
Nor blame mee not who dare presume so much;
I honor but the best, and hold you such;
None can deserue and I discerne your woorth.

In spight of fortune though you should disdaine,
I can enjoy this favour fate assignes;
Your speaking portrait drawn with liuing lines,
A greater Good than louers use to gaine.

My Loue may (as begune) last without sight,
And by degrees contemplatiuely grow;
Yet from affection curious thoughtes most flow:
I long to know whence comes so great a light,

And wish to see (since so your spright excelles)
The Paradise where such an Angell dwelles.

The next sonnet may be ranked among those which, in the sixteenth century, and the early part of the seventeenth century, were known as 'spiritual sonnets':

Our faults thy wrath deserued haue, alas!
And thou must craue just count of euerye deed;
But if our faults their punishment doe passe,
Thy Goodnesse farre our errors doth exceed.
All, all cry mercye, chargd with grief and teares,
A just remorse { subduing / orthrowing } wylier powers;
Reason can not effect in many yeares
What thy great wisdom can in few short howres.
Passed ills we see the present murn,
Stand fearfull and amazd of what should come,
Euen those hidden fires eternally that burn;
For wretched life deserueth such a doome.
But Loue to us a ray send from thy face,
And after open wide the Gates of Grace.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 151.)

The following amatory sonnet is certainly equal if not superior to many printed in Drummond's *Poems*:

Or the winged boy my thochts to thee made thral,
When babielike I knew not what was loue,
My vue embrasing al my vue could proue,
At others laughing, fearing not my fal.
With two faire eies wher Cupids mother smyled,
Thou oft invited me to venter boldlie,
As if my sad lookes spake minds language coldlie,
Til with these gleames in end I was beguild.
But free thou knewest I was no more mine awne,
Charmed in those circles where I forcst remaine;
Churlish thou doth thy wonted smyles retaine,
And, woe is me! giues oft a cruel frowne.
Alas! if loue in lookes hath made such change,
Vnkind I loue thee not but yet am strange.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 163.)

The next sonnet is particularly interesting because it contains in the concluding lines an allusion to Sir William Alexander's series of classical tragedies published under the collective title of *Monarchic Tragedies*, to Drummond's *Flowers of Sion*, and lastly to King James's poem on the battle of Lepanto which forms part of *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at vacant houres* (1591), and which had what was then the extraordinary honour to be turned into French verse—by Du Bartas, the author of the famous *Weeks*:

Melpomene in Athenes neuer song
More sueter accents, nor a more sad dittie,
Nor neare made harts bleed with a greater pitie,
Where Tyber playes his flowry banks along,
Then when she weeping deigned by Forth to sing,
Forth where thy heauenlie swannet loues to dwel,
Forth that may claim the name of that faire well
Which horses haue from flintie rocke mad spring.
But Medwaye, Severn, Tames wil not consent.
To Monarks fals if y'il not giue such praise,
Yet grant at least to him, in sweet sad layes
Who help faire Sions virgins, to lament.
And if these trumpets yeild not schrillest sounds,
Forth boasts of him who song the Turkish wounds.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 164.)

This piece in the manuscripts bears the title 'Essay out of the Italian,' but I have been unable to discover what may have been Drummond's model.

The following sonnet, as appears from the title ('In S^{r} P. d. R.'), was written in honour of Pierre de Ronsard. Owing to the handwriting being small and the ink faded, I am not sure that I have read one or two words rightly:

Great Paragon, of Poets richest Pearle,
Beneath the arctick circles statlie pole
Abut whoes point the spheares of knowledge role,
The magnet of all mynds, ear-charming Mearle;
The perfumd cabinet that muses dwel,
Enameling new-found skyes with starres of gold,
Where Pallas, with the free-borne queens enrold,
And beutie, stryfs itself for to excel.
Farre-worthier Orpheus then they who mel
With sacred Pegasus azure streames,
Or he who brocht from Heauen the fyrie beames:
Mor fit for Phebus Bay then Phebus sel.
Thy perfyt praises if the world wold writ
Must have againe thy selff for to end it.

(Hawthornden MSS., VII.)

This probably refers to Queen Elizabeth:

> Great Queene whom to the liberall Heauens propine
> All what their force or influence can impart;
> Whose virtue's rare, whose beautie's braue, but art
> Makes thee aboue thy sacred sex to shine.
> Resembling much those goddesses diuine;
> The thundrers Bride for thy heroicke hart,
> Cytherea for proportion of each part,
> Joues braine-born gyrle for judgment and ingyne.
> But now I fear my flatrie flows to farre;
> Three goddesses in one are rarely seen,
> Nor can a goddesse be vngrate—you are.
> What rests then but, a woman, and a queen:
> A woman, in vnconstancie and change,
> A Queen, because so statlie and so strange.
>
> (Hawthornden MSS., VIII, *in fine.*)

The following sonnet is avowedly an adaptation of a passage from Guarini's *Pastor Fido.* Under the title 'The Second Scene of Baptista Guarini his Pastor Fido,' we read Mirtillo's speech in Italian, and immediately after it, with the rubric 'thus in paraphrasse,' the following verses by Drummond:

> Faire cruel Silvia since thou scornes my teares,
> And ouerlookes my cares with carelesse eie;
> Since my requests in loue offends thy eares,
> Hensefoorth I vowe to hold my pace in thee and die.
> But while I hold my pace thes things sal crie:
> The brookes sal murmure, & the winds complaine;
> The hils, the dails, the deserts wher I lie,
> With the echoes of my plents sal prech my paine.
> Yet put the case thay silent wald remaine;
> Imagine brookes & winds wald hold theer pace;
> Suppose hils, dailes, and deserts wald disdaine
> T'acquaint thy deaff disdaines with my disgrace;
> Yet while thay dombe, thow deaff, to me sal proue,
> My death sal speake and let the know my loue.
>
> (Hawthornden MSS., VII.)

Among the madrigals those that follow are typical:

> Loue, once thy lawes
> I did rebellious blame;
> When they did cause
> My chastest hart to flame
> With fruitlesse vaine desire
> Of her, who scorneth both thy dartes and fire.
> But now (just Loue)
> Thee and thy lawes I free,
> And doe reproue
> Myselfe, since plaine I see
> The best but worthye is
> To couuet, not enjoye such blisse.
>
> (Hawthornden MSS., VII.)

On a lamp.

Faithfull and luved light,
That silent sees our thefts,
Be glad at the sweet sound of kisses sweet.
Oh! doe not dye! but if thou luv'st to die,
Dye amidst our delight,
When languish both our brests.
So, thou mayst dye at ease;
For lamps to mee, or starres are her faire eyes.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 51.)

Amarillis to her dog Perlin.

Faire Perlin doe not barke,
Poore foole dost thou not know
My louer, my desire?
If thou dost turne my fow,
Who to me shall be true?
Thou neare shall after any kisses haue.
Is't not enough all day
That thou do with mee stay?
Give place to night, and like her silent bee,
Lulld with the sound/noise that kisses make to thee.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 53.)

If it be trew that Echo doth remaine
Mong hardest rockes, alas
Calling so oft for Grace
To her hard hart, why answer'st not againe?
While winds and tempests blow,
The echoes silent are,
And neuer answer sounds or send so far.
So, troublet with thy stormes of loue and woe,
Or distant then when most thy griefe doth show,
She doth no answer giue.
Yet this thou may belieue
That silence ofter is aye then no.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 172.)

Other pretty trifles are:

The Gods haue heard my vowes;
Fond Lyce whose faire browes
Wont scorne with such disdaine
My Loue, my teares, my paine.

But now those springtide Roses
Are turned to winter poses,
To Rue & tyme & sage,
Fitting that shriveled age.

Now, youthes with hot desire,
See, see, that flamelesse fire,
Which earst your hartes so burned,
Quicke into ashes turned!

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 71.)

On a flye.

When this flye liu'd shee us'd to play
In the sunshine all the day;
But comming neare my Celias sight,
Shee found a new and unknown light,
So full of beautye, that it made
The midday sunne a gloomye shade.
Shee did from hand to bosome skip;
And from her brest, her cheecke, her lip,
Suckt all the incense and the spice,
And grew a Bird of Paradise.
At lenth into her eye shee flew,
Where scorchd with flame and drownd in dew,
Like Phaeton from the sunnes spheare
Shee fell; and with her dropt a teare,
Of which a pearle was straight composd,
Wherin her ashes lye enclosd.
So shee receiued from Celias eye
Flame, funerall, tombe, obsequie.

(Hawthornden MSS., VIII.)

Lastly we quote a longer piece, entitled 'Prayer going to Bed,' which runs thus:

The night is come like to the day,
Departe not Thou great God away;
Let not my Sinnes blak as the night,
Ecclipse the lustre of thy light.
Keep still in my horizon; to me now
The Sune makes not the day but Thou.
Thou whose nature cannot sleepe,
On my Temples centry keepe;
Guarde me gainst those watchfull foes,
Whose eyes are open when myne close.
Let no dreams my head infeste,
But such as Jacobs Temples blest.
While I doe rest, my soule aduance;
Make me sleep a holie Trance,
That I may take my rest, being wrought
Awake into some holye thought;
And with as actiue vigour runne
My course, as doth the nimble sunne.
Sleep is a death. O! make mee trye
By sleeping what it is to dye!
And doe thou as gentlie laye my head
On my Graue as now my Bed.
Howere refreshed, great God let mee
Awake again at last with Thee.
And thus assured, behold I lye
Securlie, or to wake or die.
These are my drowsie dayes; in vaine
I now doe wake to sleep againe.
O! come that houre, when I shall neuer
Sleep thus againe, but wake for euer!

(Hawthornden MSS., VIII.)

Of the large number of unpublished epigrams the following may in the meantime serve as specimens:

Epitaphe on a Cooke.

Heere lyes a sowre and angry cooke,
A miser, wretched man;
Who liued in smoke, and dyed in smoke,
Besides his frying pan.

(Hawthornden MSS., VIII.)

To build a tombe Jhone doth him daylie paine;
For suth he fears his father rise againe.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 158.)

Ye weep as if your husbands death you grieud;
Ye onlie weep the old man so long liud.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 159.)

Here lieth Jean that some time was a maid;
But when that was, it cannot wel be said.

(Hawthornden MSS., x, 160.)

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

CHARLES RIVIÈRE DUFRESNY.

A CÔTÉ des grands écrivains, des maîtres reconnus dont les noms forment les brillantes étapes d'une littérature, en dehors de la foule innombrable des auteurs du second ordre, il faut faire une place aux irréguliers, à ceux dont la fierté ne souffre pas qu'on les confonde avec les médiocres. Leurs noms, rappelés de temps en temps, évoquent une curiosité amusée, parfois même émue, et puis retombent dans l'oubli. La gloire semble les accueillir d'un sourire un peu dédaigneux. Il y a parmi eux de ces génies manqués, de ces grands négligents qui ont gâté ou dépensé mal à propos les dons divins qu'ils avaient reçu mission de faire fructifier. Ils sont comme les 'enfants terribles' de la littérature, et leur inaptitude à entrer dans une des catégories que nous nous sommes faites pour la plus grande tranquillité de notre esprit, a souvent empêché la postérité de rendre justice entière à l'œuvre qu'ils ont laissé derrière eux. Dufresny attend encore qu'on lui donne la place qu'il mérite.

Charles Rivière Dufresny naquit à Paris en 1648. Personne à son époque ne semble avoir mis en doute sa descendance illustre, à commencer par le Roi lui-même[1]. De même que son père avait rempli les fonctions de valet de garde-robe auprès de Louis XIII, le jeune Dufresny, présenté à la cour par le marquis de Nangis, fut immédiatement nommé valet de chambre de Louis XIV. Il partageait cet honneur avec Molière. Les devoirs attachés au titre mettaient souvent les deux cousins en présence ; le roi fut vite charmé de l'esprit et de la vivacité de son jeune parent. Dufresny entrait dans le chemin de la fortune. Au fameux passage du Rhin célébré par Boileau il était au côté du monarque, et il s'acquitta de son devoir de soldat avec toute la bravoure de sa race. Le roi lui en sut gré, et comme à son retour en France Dufresny avait résolu de prendre femme, Louis XIV insista pour le doter. En plus de la dot vraiment royale, le nouveau marié se vit nommé 'intendant des jardins du roi.' Le titre était purement

[1] Le père de Dufresny était, dit-on, fils naturel d'Henri IV et de la 'belle jardinière d'Anet.'

honorifique, et c'est plus tard, en 1700 seulement, que les travaux de Dufresny lui vaudront le poste de 'dessinateur des jardins du roi.'

Le souverain qui avait su, avec une merveilleuse perspicacité, deviner les aptitudes de ses serviteurs, avait-il entrevu le génie de son cousin pour l'horticulture ? On peut soupçonner Dufresny de l'y avoir aidé ; il n'était pas homme à se laisser dans l'ombre. Voici donc notre homme marié, riche, en faveur à la cour, en possession d'emplois honorables ; il semble qu'il dût être heureux. Mais l'instabilité de son humeur et une malheureuse passion pour le jeu ne le laissèrent pas goûter longtemps un bonheur tranquille. La dot royale fut vite dissipée, 'Tontine' en vit la majeure part. Sur ces folies le roi ferma les yeux ; il sut être grand dans sa bonté ; Dufresny reçut le privilège d'une manufacture de glaces. Le privilège reçu fut bientôt troqué contre de beaux écus sonnants et bientôt notre poète se trouva pauvre comme devant. Il semble que le roi l'ait voulu sauver alors malgré lui-même : on renouvela le privilège de la manufacture de glace, à condition que les entrepreneurs feraient au titulaire une pension de 300 livres. Dufresny, pressé de dettes, les tint quittes de la rente pour une partie du capital. Louis XIV dut alors déclarer qu'il n'était pas assez puissant pour enrichir M. Dufresny !

Le joueur avait lassé la patience royale ; il dut bien travailler, et il chercha à tirer parti de talents qu'il avait jusque-là gaspillés sans but. C'est à cette heureuse misère qu'il doit de s'être révélé à lui-même et au monde comme auteur dramatique.

Vers cette époque il se remaria. Son premier mariage n'avait guère été heureux : il a pris soin de nous le dire dans une chanson. De sa première femme nous ne savons rien, sinon que c'était une petite bourgeoise aisée du Faubourg Saint-Antoine. Elle y possédait un jardin qui fut bientôt bouleversé de fond en comble et replanté par son mari. Deux fils naquirent—pour notre malheur—de cette union ; pour notre malheur, car pris de scrupules excessifs ces deux fils reparaîtront pour exiger de leur père mourant qu'il brûle ses écrits non publiés[1].

L'histoire de son second mariage est à la fois trop et trop peu connue. C'est une assez platte aventure sur laquelle on n'insisterait pas si elle n'avait eu une réelle influence sur l'œuvre de notre auteur. La légende s'en est emparée. Lesage l'a reprise pour la mettre dans la

[1] Ils pousseront même le zèle jusqu'à réclamer à la Comédie Française les manuscrits de quatre comédies qui attendaient dans les archives leur tour de représentation. Le secrétaire répondit que les manuscrits étaient égarés et introuvables. Malgré cette sage précaution ils ne nous sont pas parvenus, car un incendie accomplit l'œuvre de destruction rêvée par les fils du poète.

bouche de son *Diable Boiteux*[1]. A bout de ressources et ne pouvant payer sa blanchisseuse (qui était jeune et jolie, et assez riche), il aurait trouvé un moyen d'acquitter ses dettes...en l'épousant (Lesage ajoute, avec son sarcasme habituel, elle et ses ducats).

Plus tard Banville reprendra le sujet dans un petit acte en vers *Le Cousin du Roi*, qu'il fit répresenter à l'Odéon en 1857 en collaboration avec Philoxène Boyer. On pourrait bien appeler cet acte: la revanche de Dufresny. Entre le vieux garçon machiavélique de Lesage et le jardinier-poète de Banville, le romantisme a passé. Il y a dans *Le Cousin du Roi* du Gringoire avec quelques plumes qu'on croirait arrachées au panache de Cyrano. Il est ce bohême élégant, fantaisiste et sentimental, que rêvaient les 'Jeune-France.' La blanchisseuse, la fraîche Angélique, est depuis son enfance amoureuse du poète qui hésite à l'épouser lorsqu'il la sait riche. Mais voici qu'apparaît le *deus ex machina*, le grand Roi dont la libéralité enrichit le parent pauvre et permet au mariage de s'accomplir.

Il n'est pas déraisonnable de croire qu' 'Angélique' ait eu du penchant pour le poète. Elle méritait en tout cas l'honneur qui lui fut fait; elle fit preuve des plus hautes qualités d'intelligence et de cœur en se faisant aimer et respecter d'un mari comme Dufresny, de son vivant, en le laissant inconsolable après sa mort. Elle fit plus; elle sut retenir à la maison ce coureur de brelans, et plus encore, elle obtint de lui qu'il *travaillât*. En cela, elle mérite notre reconnaissance: ne lui devons-nous pas quelques-unes des meilleures pièces de Dufresny?

Après la mort d' 'Angélique,' Dufresny retomba dans la vie de bohème, habitant à la fois quatre logis en des quartiers différents pour échapper aux visites importunes, essayant de regagner autour des tables de jeu sa fortune disparue. Mais il était né sous une bonne étoile et son esprit le tira momentanément d'embarras. On essayait alors d'établir une banque nationale par le système de Law. On parlait d'enrichissements fabuleux et rapides. Dufresny envoya au Régent un billet ainsi conçu: 'Pour votre gloire, Monseigneur, il faut laisser Dufresny dans son excessive pauvreté, afin qu'il reste au moins un seul homme dans une situation qui fasse souvenir que tout le royaume était aussi pauvre que Dufresny avant que vous y eussiez mis la main.'

Le régent, qui se connaissait en esprit, écrivit 'néant' au bas de cette singulière requête et donna l'ordre à Law de compter 200,000 f. au solliciteur. Avec cette somme, Dufresny, que la misère avait assagi, se hâta de faire bâtir une maison. C'est dans sa 'maison de Pline,'

[1] Livre X.

comme il l'appelait, qu'il mourut en 1724, plein de repentir et de bons sentiments.

Une vie si peu édifiante, et dont nous connaissons si bien toutes les tares, ne pouvait manquer de laisser sur la mémoire de Dufresny une teinte sombre aux yeux de la postérité. Et pourtant, pas plus que La Fontaine, les contemporains ne semblent avoir jugé sévèrement ce joyeux compagnon dont l'amabilité enjouée, la franchise, la délicatesse d'esprit les charmaient malgré eux. Ils auraient volontiers souscrit à ces vers de Banville:

> Beau joueur, grand par l'âme et par la bourse mince,
> Il a le sort d'un gueux et la fierté d'un prince.

Il demeura indépendant et fier, dans sa vie comme dans son art, malgré l'empressement avec lequel il ramassait les miettes de la table du grand Roi. Le fait était commun à son époque et personne ne voyait de honte à être l'obligé du grand dispensateur de tous les biens.

En morale, il avait les meilleures dispositions du monde et pouvait prêcher la vertu, tout aussi bien qu'un autre, mais comme le poète latin, il voyait les meilleures choses et il suivait les pires. Toute sa vie il fut l'enfant gâté qu'une situation privilégiée a mis hors de la règle commune et qui jamais n'apprit à résister à un desir, à un caprice. La vie lui semblait comme un chemin sans but dont il cueillit en passant toutes les fleurs. Tout en lui trahit une telle insouciance, on pourrait dire une telle inconscience, qu'on ne saurait lui en vouloir. Il ressemble aux jolis aventuriers, héros des romans et des comédies de son temps, dont l'élégante désinvolture, la naïve perversité et l'esprit séduisant entraînent les cœurs malgré la raison.

Un tableau de Coypel nous le montre souriant sous sa grande perruque: l'œil est vif, un peu moqueur, le regard très franc. La bouche plissée et malicieuse est surmontée d'un nez royal. Sa figure un peu pleine se termine par un menton de satirique qui rappelle celui de Boileau. L'expression de la physionomie est à la fois très sympathique et très spirituelle. En face de cet aimable épicurien, on comprend mieux sa réponse à un ami qui le consolait de sa détresse par le dicton populaire: 'Non, répliqua-t-il, non, pauvreté n'est pas vice...c'est bien pis!'

Il est possible, pour les caractères faibles, de naître trop bien doués et de faire mentir le proverbe: rien ne leur nuit plus que l'abondance de biens. Dufresny avait des dispositions marquées pour tous les arts. Sachant tout, sans avoir jamais rien appris, il composait toujours les airs de ses chansons. Il les faisait noter par son ami Grandval, car il

eut été incapable d'écrire une note de musique. Un assez grand nombre de ces chansons nous sont parvenues, soit intercalées dans le *Mercure Galant*, soit publiées à la suite des comédies auxquelles elles appartiennent. Elles sont bien 'de l'homme même.' Le rythme en est net, le dessin un peu désordonné, l'inspiration presque toujours fraîche et originale.

Comme il n'avait pas plus appris à dessiner qu'à composer, il imagina un moyen de réaliser ses combinaisons artistiques: il découpait dans des estampes des personnages qu'il arrangeait ensuite au gré de son caprice. Les contemporains ont été frappés des résultats extraordinaires de fantaisie et de vérité qu'il obtenait ainsi.

Mais c'est vers une autre région que devaient se porter avant tout ses efforts artistiques. Au moment où Louis XIV, emerveillé et choqué de la magnificence des jardins de Fouquet à Vaux, voulut créer à Versailles des jardins dignes par leurs proportions et leur beauté du palais qu'ils devaient entourer, Dufresny avait soumis au roi quelques dessins de sa composition. Le monarque avait rêvé grand, mais son cousin avait imaginé plus grand encore. La nouveauté, le goût de ces dessins séduisirent le roi et ce fut, dit-on, faute d'argent qu'ils ne furent pas exécutés. Peut-être aussi n'étaient-ils pas assez classiques. Dufresny reçut, en compensation, le titre de 'dessinateur des jardins du Roi.' On mit en outre à sa disposition dans le bois de Vincennes un coin de terrain, qu'il put défoncer, planter et replanter tout à son aise. Ce fut bientôt un but de promenade pour les Parisiens. Plus d'un tranquille bourgeois, ami de l'ordre et du cordeau, en allant un beau dimanche avec sa famille voir le jardin de M. Dufresny, dut ouvrir des yeux effarés devant l'imprévu du vallonnement et la bizarrerie du dessin. Mais la foule parisienne comprit et s'associa avec le poète jardinier contre la froideur et la correction des jardins officiels de l'époque. Dufresny fut vite célèbre; on l'opposa même à Le Nôtre qui triomphait alors à Versailles. Là, l'esprit classique trouve son expression jusque dans la coupe même des arbres. La nature y est soumise aux exigences de la raison humaine. A une époque où rien n'intéresse l'homme en dehors de l'homme même, l'esprit humain cherche à retrouver jusque dans les bosquets et les gazons son besoin d'alignement et de symétrie. On se rappelle la description qu'en donne Gautier: 'Un art magnifique, grandiose, solennel, partout du marbre, du bronze, des Neptunes, des Tritons, des nymphes, des ifs en quenouilles, des buis en pot-au-feu, tout ce qu'on peut imaginer de plus noble, de plus riche, de plus coûteux, de plus impossible: mais au bout d'une heure ou deux de

promenade, vous sentez l'ennui vous tomber sur le dos en pluie fine avec la rosée des jets d'eau. Vous vous prenez malgré vous à désirer quelque petit coin de paysage agreste.' Il dut y avoir quelque chose de semblable dans l'impression que Dufresny avait des jardins de l'époque, et il chercha le paysage agreste. De même que 80 ans plus tôt Bacon s'était insurgé contre la régularité des jardins de Hampton Court, Dufresny se révolte contre la symétrie des jardins français. Les écrivains anglais les plus classiques, Addison et Pope, condamnaient le jardin de la Renaissance.

Dufresny, grand ennemi des règles et des conventions, veut imiter la nature dans ses formes capricieuses. Un parc accidenté avec de grands arbres qui poussent ici et là en toute robustesse, en toute liberté; de frais gazons aux bords irréguliers, au milieu desquelles serpente un gracieux ruisseau, en un mot, c'est le parc anglais qu'il lui faut. Est-ce de sa propre imagination que Dufresny a tiré ses réformes? Nous n'avons nul moyen de nous en assurer. S'il ne le connaissait, il était du moins digne de connaître le génie anglais; ce génie qui, selon Voltaire, ressemble à un arbre touffu planté par la nature, jetant au hasard mille rameaux et croissant inégalement avec force—et qui meurt si on veut forcer sa nature et le tailler en arbre de Marly.

Dufresny fut écrivain comme il fut jardinier; il échappa aux règles et se refusa d'entrer dans aucune catégorie reconnue. Il voulut écrire quand bon lui semblait et sans contrainte. Or malgré sa paresse, son œuvre est assez considérable. Elle comprend un petit opuscule: les *Entretiens sérieux et comiques*; des contes, essais, dissertations pour la plupart écrit pour le *Mercure Galant* ainsi que bon nombre de chansons; des farces et une vingtaine de comédies, dont les plus intéressantes sont *L'Esprit de contradiction* (1700), *Le double Veuvage* (1702), *La Coquette du Village* (1715), *La Réconciliation normande* (1719), *Le Mariage fait et rompu* (1721). A cela il faut ajouter une suite des *Entretiens* et quelques comédies sacrifiées aux scrupules de ses fils ou dévorées par l'incendie. Les œuvres qui restent remplissent 6 volumes de l'édition de 1731, réimprimée en 1747. La rareté, pour ne pas dire l'absence d'éditions plus récentes, est la meilleure preuve du dédain où a été tenue sa mémoire. Jusqu'à quel point un tel dédain est-il justifié et le nom de Dufresny mérite-t-il d'être sorti de la demi-obscurité où il est resté enseveli? C'est ce qu'il nous reste à examiner.

'Dufresny n'a pas eu cette bonne fortune de rester populaire et joué. Son nom vit encore; les titres de ses comédies demeurent; de

rares lettrés en ont lu quelques-unes, et c'est tout. C'est peut-être trop peu.' C'est ainsi que s'exprime un des historiens les plus autorisés de notre littérature dramatique[1]. C'est à peu près ainsi que s'expriment tous ceux qu'une heureuse curiosité a poussés à lire son théâtre et qui ont eu la surprise d'en découvrir pour eux-mêmes les précieuses qualités. D'où vient donc cet oubli étrange et tel qu'un des manuels les plus complets et qui ont le plus fait pour répandre la connaissance de la littérature française, ne mentionne même pas le nom de Dufresny au chapitre du théâtre ?

L'injustice peut être expliquée, sinon justifiée. Une première raison vient sans doute de l'excentricité même de sa vie. Il est resté dans la mémoire des hommes le poète-jardinier, cousin de Louis XIV, bohème funambule dont on se rappelle la vie accidentée sans jamais lire les œuvres. Mais ses œuvres même, il faut l'avouer, nous fourniront des raisons plus solides. Ses comédies sont brillantes d'esprit : on peut être trop spirituel. Rien ne lui échappe ; son œil subtil aperçoit mille rapports ingénieux et inattendus entre les choses, mille nuances à peine perceptibles dans les sentiments ; ces rapports, ces nuances, il cherche à les traduire avec finesse dans son théâtre. C'est ce qui produit à la lecture de ses pièces un plaisir délicat d'une nature toute particulière ; mais c'est aussi ce qui les empêchera de réussir auprès du grand public. D'Alembert l'a dit ; le public ne prit plaisir à ses finesses que lorsqu'il en eut été averti par les connaisseurs. Bon nombre de plaisanteries ne passaient pas la rampe.

Ceci pourtant ne suffirait pas à expliquer le dédain des lettrés si Dufresny n'avait laissé que des œuvres bien faites. Malheureusement notre auteur porte avec lui le châtiment de son incurable paresse. Il n'a pas pris la peine de faire valoir les idées neuves et fructueuses qu'il apportait à la scène. Ses intrigues, tout ingénieuses qu'elles soient, restent parfois incohérentes, faute de travail. La seule comédie vraiment parfaite que nous ayons de lui est une comédie en un acte. Ses dernières œuvres donnent l'impression d'un auteur jeune et manquant d'expérience. Selon le mot de Petit de Julleville : 'jusqu'à 73 ans, il a donné des promesses brillantes.' Devant ce génie resté, pour ainsi dire, 'en friche' on se prend à regretter qu'il n'eût point trouvé un collaborateur honnête autant qu'adroit. Sa brouille avec Regnard est encore une des raisons qui nuisirent à sa popularité ; il eut le tort de s'opposer à un auteur glorieux incontesté, il commit la

[1] H. Lion, dans *l'Histoire de la littérature française* de Petit de Julleville.

maladresse d'obliger le public à comparer une œuvre polie et bien faite avec une comédie, peut-être plus originale, mais d'exécution fort inférieure et négligée.

Dufresny eut le sort des inventeurs. Il manquait de méthode, d'autres vinrent qui surent tirer profit et gloire de ses idées: bonne raison pour tenir dans l'ombre le nom d'un confrère dont ils étaient secrètement les obligés. Quant à ceux qui n'avaient pas le même besoin de le tenir à l'écart, puisqu'ils ne lui devaient rien, ils se contentèrent de répéter les affirmations arbitraires et injustes des frères Parfaict dans leur *Histoire du Théâtre Français*, jugeant, sans les avoir lues, les comédies de Dufresny 'fort au-dessous de celles de Dancourt' pour la conduite de l'intrigue et l'entente de la scène[1]. Seuls quelques historiens plus exacts[2] ont essayé de redonner à Dufresny et sa physionomie réelle et la place qu'il doit occuper dans l'histoire du théâtre français—entre Molière et Marivaux.

Parmi les ouvrages de Dufresny, autres que ses comédies, les *Entretiens Sérieux et Comiques* attirent notre attention par leur titre un peu inquiétant et piquant, et l'allure dégagée de leur préface. Dès les premières pages nous savons que nous avons affaire à un homme d'esprit. Cet esprit est tout pénétré de raison: 'Je me mets au-dessus de tout, nous dit-il en effet, excepté du *bon sens*.' Et plus tard il le répétera d'une façon plus mordante: 'Je n'affecte jamais d'être singulier, et le bon sens seul m'éloigne ici de l'usage ordinaire.' Cependant il y aura moyen d'être original et neuf sans jamais s'écarter de la nature. C'est à trouver ce moyen que Dufresny s'est appliqué. Les *Entretiens* nous en convainquent bientôt. Le livre se compose d'une série d'observations sur les mœurs contemporaines. Là, comme dans *Les Caractères* de La Bruyère auxquels les *Entretiens* peuvent servir de complément, l'auteur rend au public ce qu'il lui a prêté. Il répond au savant qui lui recommande l'imitation des anciens: 'Je vous entends, il faut piller; mais je ne pillerai ni dans les Livres anciens, ni dans les Livres modernes; je ne veux piller que dans le Livre du monde.'

Là comme dans *Les Caractères* quelque chose annonce le XVIII^e^ siècle. On commence à s'intéresser aux hommes plutôt qu'à l'homme. Les *Onuphres* remplacent *Tartufe*: il n'y a plus d'avare mais des

[1] Il est certain que les comédies de Dufresny n'ont pas l'intérêt documentaire de celles du 'Premier des Vaudevillistes.' C'est en grande partie la valeur 'numismatique' des pièces de Dancourt qui lui a assuré une gloire plus durable.

[2] En particulier M. H. Lion (Petit de Julleville); M. Lintilhac, *Histoire du Théâtre en France*, vol. IV.

avares. Ce sont des silhouettes assez précises que crayonne Dufresny. Mais comment les fera-t-il défiler devant nos yeux? Pas de galeries de tableaux comme chez La Bruyère, avec du vide entre les cadres: il faut relier entre eux ces amusements. Et Dufresny s'avise d'un procédé inédit: il fera venir un Siamois à Paris. Tout sera étrange et nouveau pour cet habitant d'un autre monde. Ainsi seront expliquées et excusées les remarques les plus malicieusement naïves sur la société contemporaine. L'idée est aujourd'hui connue de tous: c'est celle des *Lettres Persanes*. Il est curieux que Montesquieu, qui n'a pu cacher son emprunt à personne (car les *Entretiens* étaient entre toutes les mains à son époque), n'ait même pas salué Dufresny dans sa préface.

Notre Siamois donc, est effaré du brouhaha des rues de Paris, et encore plus de l'animation des Parisiens. Le Persan de Montesquieu s'en souviendra. Mais le Siamois et lui ne vont pas aux mêmes endroits. Dufresny mène son héros à l'opéra, puisque c'est la mode. De là il part en excursion pour le pays de mariage. Nous sommes alors tout étonnés de constater que la carte du Tendre sert encore de guide aux jeunes romanesques. Boileau vieilli n'a plus guère la force de brandir sa fourche à l'entrée de la chambre du goût et les rééditions de la Calprenède se multiplient. Passons avec le Siamois à l'Université pour laquelle il n'a pas le plus grand respect. Dufresny partage déjà la défiance du XVIII^e^ siècle pour la métaphysique. Plus loin nous tombons au milieu des médecins, auxquels il est toujours bon de décocher quelques épigrammes. Molière ne les a pas tués et il est mort sans eux.

Mais continuons notre voyage: nous voici dans un cercle bourgeois, 'assemblée grave et mal assise sur de petits tabourets arrangés en rond; où toutes les femmes parlent et pas une n'écoute, où on raisonne sur rien, où on décide de tout.' On y rencontre le magistrat dogmatisant, le vaniteux qui sourit sans les comprendre aux épigrammes dont il est l'objet, et l'esprit de travers qui les prend pour lui et quitte brusquement la compagnie. Voici des personnages que nous retrouverons dans les comédies: la joueuse acharnée, le faux sincère fou de probité, le nouveau riche vaniteux et maladroit. Tous ces gens là vivent, s'agitent, jouent devant nous le drame ou la comédie de leurs passions. Si la peinture en reste inférieure à celle des *Lettres Persanes*, elle occupe à côté d'elle un rang très honorable. On peut y glaner des traits, des observations dignes de La Bruyère. Telle est cette remarque que Dufresny avait faite avant M. Perrichon: 'Nous n'aimons guère ceux à qui nous devons; nous aimons mieux ceux qui nous doivent.'

Dans ce petit livre l'auteur a essayé d'étudier les hommes, mais il désespère d'y atteindre, 'car, dit-il, la vie est trop courte pour connaître un seul homme.'

Il s'y essaya de nouveau dans les feuilles du *Mercure Galant*, le futur *Mercure de France*, dont il reçut le privilège après la mort de son fondateur Vizé et qu'il dirigea pendant cinq ans, de 1710 à 1715, jusqu'à la mort de sa deuxième femme.

Ce journal, le plus ancien en France après la *Gazette* de Théophraste Renaudot, était très lu à cette époque; Dufresny y publia les articles les plus divers, depuis des contes arabes, un parallèle d'Homère et de Rabelais, des expériences de physique, jusqu'à des chansons à siffler. Un certain nombre de ces articles, dont quelques-uns sont du meilleur Dufresny, ont été compris dans l'édition complète des ses œuvres.

Dufresny n'aborda la comédie qu'à l'âge de 44 ans. Il n'était pas tout à fait un nouveau venu dans le monde du théâtre, car au temps de sa grandeur il s'était plu à jouer le rôle de Mécène au royaume des comédiens. Il y rentrait cette fois par la petite porte, la main dans celle de Regnard. En cette année 1692, l'auteur des *Folies amoureuses* écrivait encore pour les comédiens italiens.

Les Chinois, *La Baguette de Vulcain*, *La Foire St Germain*, et d'autres sortirent de leur fructueuse collaboration. *La Foire St Germain* eut tant de succès que les comédiens français se crurent obligés de lui opposer, sans grand succès, une pièce du même titre écrite par Dancourt. En outre de la peinture très animée d'une foire parisienne, la pièce contient quelques parodies de fables ou de tragédies antiques fort amusantes. Les éditeurs de Regnard y voient partout la main du maître et font bon marché du talent de Dufresny. Pourtant dans l'originalité des plaisanteries, dans l'inattendu des situations, on peut aisément reconnaître la marque personnelle de l'auteur des *Entretiens*. Ne faut-il pas lui attribuer une boutade comme celle-ci: 'une femme, c'est un composé harmonique où se trouve quelquefois bien des dissonances.' Du reste, avec *L'Opéra de Campagne* et *Les Contes de la Mère Loye*, Dufresny saura atteindre le succès sans l'aide de Regnard.

La plupart des pièces données aux Italiens sont sans aucune valeur littéraire. Car on allait au Théâtre Italien comme nous allons aujourd'hui au 'Palais Royal.' On allait là pour rire; et on oubliait à la porte les règles et les unités. Grâce à la faveur royale, et à l'immunité qu'on accorde aux théâtres 'à côté,' les Italiens avaient joui d'une entière indépendance. C'est dans cette liberté, allant jusqu'à l'extrême licence, où rien ne gênait la fantaisie des auteurs, que les Regnard et les

Dufresny vinrent faire leurs premières armes. Boileau, nous dit Brossette, déclarait que depuis Molière il n'y avait pas eu de bonnes pièces au Théâtre Français et qu'il fallait aller aux Italiens: là il y avait de bonnes choses et de véritables plaisanteries—et du sel partout. De fait les plus grosses saillies n'étaient souvent que l'exagération d'une observation juste. Tandis que la tragédie se meurt dans une pâle imitation d'une imitation, la comédie renouvelle ses forces en reprenant contact avec la vie, à travers la farce. Qui dira tout ce que la haute comédie doit aux pantalonnades des Italiens?

L'année même où il débutait aux Italiens, en 1692, Dufresny abordait seul la scène des comédiens français avec les cinq actes en prose du *Négligent*. Le succès n'en fut que médiocre. Il continuait cependant à écrire des farces avec Regnard, lorsque brusquement leur collaboration prit fin comme tant d'autres, par une querelle.

Le 16 décembre, 1696, Regnard donnait son *Joueur* aux Français. Deux mois après, sur le même théâtre, Dufresny faisait représenter le *Chevalier Joueur* et dans un prologue il accuse Regnard de plagiat. De son côté, dans sa préface, Regnard parle d'un 'plagiaire' qu'il accuse de reproduire en prose sa comédie. Le poète Gacon en fit une épigramme qui se termine ainsi:

> Chacun vola son compagnon;
> Mais quiconque aujourd'hui voit l'un et l'autre ouvrage
> Dit que Regnard a l'avantage
> D'avoir été le bon larron.

En effet le public prit parti pour Regnard et la pièce de Dufresny tomba sans appel. Le public avait raison, car le *Joueur* est bien supérieur au *Chevalier Joueur*, ouvrage curieux, plein de saveur mais hâtif et mal bâti. Les deux compères devaient pouvoir dessiner la physionomie d'un joueur: ils n'avaient qu'à s'observer mutuellement. C'est du reste un caractère qui semble hanter Dufresny; il l'avait déjà esquissé dans les *Entretiens*, il le reprendra en 1709 dans la *Joueuse*. A partir de 1696, Dufresny travaille seul pour le Théâtre Français, qu'il ne cesse d'alimenter de ses comédies jusqu'à sa mort.

La partie la plus durable de l'œuvre de Dufresny c'est le Théâtre joué par les comédiens français. Cherchons à y pénétrer et à démêler les impressions successives qu'il produira sur nous. D'abord notre curiosité est piquée, amusée: rien n'est épargné pour la tenir en éveil. Notre auteur a l'esprit fin. Il n'a pas cette gaîté de Molière, si mâle et si profonde

> Que lorsqu'on vient d'en rire, on devrait en pleurer.

Mais ce n'est pas davantage, cette fête perpétuelle, ce feu d'artifice dont Beaumarchais éblouira son auditoire: c'est une gaîté assez nouvelle, une gaîté entre deux, subtile, pleine d'ingéniosité, d'imprévu, de ressources neuves, une gaîté délicate qui fait sourire plutôt qu'elle ne fait rire. L'esprit y crépite, pétille plutôt qu'il n'éclate. On le sent partout et il est presque insaisissable. Il semble sortir naturellement des caractères et des situations. Il pare le dialogue sans y ajouter de faux brillants. Mais surtout, et le sévère La Harpe lui-même, tout en reprochant à Dufresny de le prodiguer trop à tous ses personnages, le proclame hautement, c'est un esprit absolument original.

On a trouvé le style des comédies un peu sec. La faute en est peut-être moins à notre auteur qu'à son époque. L'impression de dureté qu'il peut donner est souvent due à un excès de précision. Mais c'est là le défaut de ses qualités. Sa prose est nerveuse, serrée. Elle moule la pensée comme un vêtement bien fait (la pensée, il est vrai, prend souvent une forme imprévue). Dufresny a l'honneur d'avoir été un des premiers à combattre en faveur de la prose dans la haute comédie. Auparavant on exigeait qu'elle fût en vers; la poésie était, si l'on peut dire, comme un habit de soirée rendu de rigueur par le voisinage de la tragédie. Or la comédie devenait de plus en plus réaliste, et Dufresny et Dancourt lui rendirent un grand service en la débarrassant d'un vêtement trop roide.

Les vers de Dufresny sont plus inégaux que sa prose. On y trouve quelques rares traces de l'influence de Regnard, des cascades de vocables sonores:

> Mais pendant quelque temps, agiote, grappille,
> Contrôle, taille, rogne, en plein pille et repille;
> A force d'encaisser, de compter, d'escompter,
> Tu pourras parvenir à te faire écouter.
>
> (*La Coquette du Village*, I, 3.)

Mais en général ses vers sont bien à lui. Il y en a d'heureux dont l'aisance et la tournure piquante méritent d'être retenues. Telle est cette description de la jeunesse où le poète semble d'être dépeint lui-même:

> J'admire la jeunesse et sa vivacité,
> Passant toujours de l'une à l'autre extrémité,
> De l'excessive crainte à l'espérance folle;
> Parlant, parlant, parlant, puis perdant la parole;
> Courant, courant, courant, puis s'arrêtant tout court,
> En un seul jour, aimant et perdant son amour,
> Pour un amant nouveau le retrouvant ensuite;
> Voulant, ne voulant pas; sans règle, sans conduite,
> Sans arrêt, sans raison: que de défauts elle a,
> Cette jeunesse! On l'aime avec ces défauts-là.
>
> (*La Réconciliation normande.*)

Le dialogue est vif, menu, un peu haché peut-être. Les répliques se succèdent comme des parades d'escrime dans un cliquetis continuel qui tient en éveil l'attention.

Damis (à la Présidente): Quand on a de l'esprit, on se tire d'affaire.
La Présidente: L'on n'en a pas besoin quand on est innocent.
Damis. Il en faut pour le monde ; il est si médisant !
La Prés.: Je fermerai les yeux sur tout ce qui se passe,
Mais vous m'accorderez une petite grâce:
Pour me la refuser vous êtes trop sensé.
Damis: Je fermerai les yeux sur ce qui s'est passé,
Mais vous m'accorderez une grâce assez grande.
La Prés.: Accordez-moi d'abord ce que je vous demande.
(*Le Mariage fait et rompu*, III, 5.)

On sait gré à l'auteur de ses trouvailles, qui chatouillent l'esprit, sans jamais s'éloigner du naturel. Le dialogue dans son ingéniosité répond absolument à *l'invention.* Ni Regnard ni Dancourt ne se sont préoccupés de renouveler le magasin d'intrigues de la comédie française. Peu importe, au fond, la donnée d'une pièce lorsque les caractères en modifieront l'action comme chez Molière. Mais le secret de son art semble perdu. Ce sont des 'trucs,' toujours les mêmes, que les autres emploient. Dufresny arrive, le sac plein d'idées neuves.

On a taxé d'incohérence certaines de ses intrigues. Un tel défaut peut paraître surprenant chez un homme qui avait au suprême degré le génie de l'organisation artistique. Car tout se tient, et son habilité à composer des tableaux avec des découpages, à dessiner des jardins, à bâtir une intrigue, n'est-ce-pas cet instinct de l'artiste qui le guide dans l'arrangement des parties ? L'instinct, chez Dufresny, n'était pas modifié par l'étude des règles. D'où une certaine irrégularité, et un peu de confusion qui trahissent le manque de travail. Il n'a pas su déduire patiemment les conséquences de son idée et faire difficilement des choses faciles. Il n'a pas vécu avec son sujet pendant de longs jours. Une idée aussitôt conçue est aussitôt notée.

Une seule comédie échappe entièrement à ce reproche, c'est un acte en prose dont la réputation a été grande, qui a été traduit et joué en plusieurs langues: *L'Esprit de contradiction.*

Mme Oronte est d'humeur contrariante. Sa volonté, comme le dit pittoresquement le jardinier Lucas, est du naturel des hiboux : elle ne va jamais de compagnie avec la volonté des autres. Elle s'est mis dans la tête de renvoyer son jardinier. Elle le renvoie du reste tous les jours. C'est un besoin chronique. Mais cette fois, M. Oronte prend le parti de Lucas et c'est pour sa femme une raison de plus d'exiger son renvoi. Lucas connaît sa maîtresse. Il est fin. Il fait semblant d'être enchanté de partir. Toutefois pour plus de vraisemblance, il

affecte de cacher poliment sa joie. Dès lors les choses changent de face, et rien ne pourra empêcher Mme Oronte de garder le jardinier à son service. C'est ainsi que l'auteur nous présente son héroïne en une jolie scène d'exposition. Or M. Oronte veut marier sa fille Angélique à un riche négociant de ses amis, Thibaudois—un gros rustaud qui a des bagues à tous les doigts et qui a la mauvaise habitude de tutoyer tout le monde. Angélique ne se sent pas beaucoup d'inclination pour ce butor, et naturellement elle aime le jeune et beau Valère. Il s'agit pour les deux compères Oronte et Thibaudois, de s'assurer du consentement de Mme Oronte, car comme dit Thibaudois: 'C'est une terrible femme que l'esprit de ta femme.' Si tout le monde est d'accord pour marier Angélique, Mme Oronte trouvera bien moyen de contredire. On a recours au malin jardinier: l'expédient qu'il imagine est simple: on dira que l'époux choisi par M. Oronte est Valère, et Mme choisira immédiatement Thibaudois. Les choses se passent comme on l'avait prévu. Mais on avait compté sans Angélique. La jeune rusée fait parvenir à sa mère un billet dans lequel elle dénonce la ruse de Lucas. Mme Oronte comprend et feint de se soumettre aux volontés de son mari. Oronte n'en revient pas: 'Il faut être bien malheureux, dit-il. La seule fois de sa vie qu'elle ne me contredit pas, c'est pour me contredire.' Sur ces entrefaites, Valère revient. En amoureux inquiet, comme tous les Valère, il prend au sérieux les amabilités qu'Angélique prodigue à Thibaudois. Ce malentendu amène entre les amoureux une querelle dont Mme Oronte est témoin. Sur le champ elle décide de marier Valère et Angélique, puisqu'ils ne s'entendent plus. Ainsi elle fera pièce à son mari et contredira tout le monde à la fois.

La pièce semble donc terminée, lorsque reparait Lucas. Il a flairé un complot qui dérange le sien et menace de tout révéler. Tout est perdu! Heureusement Lucas est très sensible aux arguments sonnants, et si Thibaudois est riche, Valère est généreux. Lucas ne dira rien et le tour est joué.

'On aime à voir des caractères soutenus, une intrigue nette et suivie, des situations qui surprennent, quoiqu'elles soient bien préparées, et de temps en temps quelque plaisanterie sans grossièreté.' Voilà l'idéal de la comédie, tel qu'il nous est présenté dans le prologue du *Double Veuvage*. Il ne s'agit donc pas seulement d'une trame légère et spirituelle; il faut des caractères. Rien ne pique plus notre auteur que d'être traité en homme simplement spirituel. Il s'en plaint dans une préface[1]:

[1] *La Coquette du Village.*

Un ami zélé me dit: 'La pièce est bonne, mais il y a des défauts.' 'Au contraire, la pièce ne vaut rien,' dit un autre, 'mais il y a de jolies choses.' Je vous entends: vous faites ensuite l'éloge de *quelque saillie brillante.* Je vous reconnais; vous êtes auteur, Mons. Vadius. J'aperçois dans les Tuileries un docte censeur; il est de la clique d'Aristophane, il a l'air ennuyé et dégoûté, car il sort de ma comédie; il me voit, il prend un autre visage et me dit gracieusement: 'Je vous félicite, il y a de l'esprit dans tout ce que vous faites.' Je vous connais, masque; vous me vendez cher cet esprit-là, quand vous faites mon éloge à d'autres qu'à moi.

Dufresny continue la comédie de mœurs. Si ses caractères ne sont pas tous très creusés, ils vivent pourtant. C'est un défilé d'originaux: voici en tête, les amoureux, car en cela Dufresny n'a pas innové et toutes ses comédies finissent par un mariage. C'est d'abord la jeune Angélique de l'Esprit de Contradiction, adroite, tranquille et fine. Elle oppose à sa mère une force d'inertie qui oblige la bonne dame à imaginer les réponses de sa fille pour pouvoir les contredire. Alors que tout le monde s'agite, elle tire tranquillement son épingle du jeu. C'est elle qui mène l'action. Mais personne ne s'en doute jusqu'à la fin, pas plus les spectateurs que les autres personnages de la comédie.

Voici la joyeuse Thérèse du *Double Veuvage* toujours riant, toujours dansant. Il est tout naturel qu'avec un caractère aussi gai, elle soit tombée amoureuse d'un homme mélancolique comme Dorante, affligé d'une délicatesse inquiète. Le rire de Thérèse le fâche et elle rit de le voir fâché. Si elle est trop empressée, elle n'est pas sincère; si elle tarde à venir, c'est qu'elle ne l'aime pas. Ce Dorante-là est par certains côtés l'ancêtre d'un personnage de Sheridan, le Faulkland des *Rivals*, qui croit trouver 'something unkind in the violent, robust, unfeeling health' de sa maîtresse. Écoutons Dorante: 'Ravie de me voir! Ah! je ne confonds point cette gaieté dissipée avec le plaisir sensible et passionné que doit causer la vue de ce qu'on aime.' 'Si vous aimiez, on vous verrait comme moi inquiète, agitée; et dans l'horreur d'une incertitude cruelle, languir, soupirer, gémir.'

Dufresny reprend ce type un peu indécis dans le Valère du *Mariage fait et rompu.* Valère est un rêveur qui passe des heures les yeux perdus sur la mer. Nous sommes en 1720. On n'attend guère cette attitude avant Rousseau. C'est un chapitre d'avant-garde à ajouter à l'étude du sentiment de la nature au XVIII^e^ siècle.

Le mieux venu de ces caractères, c'est peut-être la coquette du village. La jeune Lisette qui à neuf ans était déjà une coquette fieffée voit ses talents se développer prodigieusement grâce aux leçons d'une veuve experte en l'art de séduire. Elle a du reste soin de passer aux yeux de sa maîtresse pour plus sotte qu'elle n'est; elle ne veut pas

exciter sa jalousie. En vraie fille de paysan, elle a un but pratique. Elle est aimée d'un jeune intendant, mais qu'est cela pour elle? il lui faut pour le moins un homme riche, sinon le seigneur du village lui-même. Pour n'en manquer aucun, elle parvient à se faire aimer des trois à la fois. Lorsque son manège est découvert, elle se tire d'affaire avec une habileté surprenante et nouvelle. Cette jeune personne qui élabore des plans machiavéliques, se décide brusquement, par à-coups. Elle n'en est que plus vraie. Son intelligence aiguë parviendrait à ses fins, sans un stratagème imaginé par le jeune intendant qui la ramène au bon sens et punit cette Célimène en sabots par où elle avait péché.

Le père de la coquette, le fermier Lucas, est une des meilleures figures de paysans qui soient au théâtre. Ce sont de réels paysans que Dufresny nous montre, et qui parlent leur jargon. On appelait cela des 'Dancourades,' parce que Dancourt avait ramené ce réalisme sur la scène française. Lucas a pris quarante billets de loterie. On lui fait croire qu'il a gagné le gros lot, et le voilà aussitôt fier et insolent, daignant dans sa bonté assurer son seigneur de sa protection. Il ne rêve plus qu'une chose: c'est d'aller à Paris. On sent en lui le désir de jouir et la haine de ses supérieurs.

Presque tous les personnages épisodiques seraient à citer; tel est le couple amusant du Président et de la Présidente dans le *Mariage fait et rompu.* Le mari marche derrière sa femme dont il admire et craint la volonté, tout en essayant piteusement de garder sa propre dignité:

Oui, ma femme, agissez seule, je vous l'ordonne.

Tel est encore le personnage souvent cité de Glacignac, le froid gascon, pince sans rire; le meilleur gascon, dit La Harpe, qu'on ait mis au théâtre. Il faut encore nommer l'hôtesse à la langue bien pendue, bonne et autoritaire, disant à chacun son fait, quitte à arranger toujours les choses pour le mieux de chacun. Ces derniers personnages sont tirés du *Mariage fait et rompu* qui avec la *Réconciliation normande* nous offre le plus grand nombre de scènes parfaites. Car il faut plutôt chercher les scènes que l'ensemble chez Dufresny. Dans ce cadre restreint il déploie toute son intelligence, toute sa connaissance des hommes. Il évite avec grand soin tout ce qui peut ressembler à une psychologie conventionnelle, il nous fait sentir le contact avec la réalité. Il en résulte une impression de grande fraîcheur et d'originalité.

Destouches avait senti en Dufresny un rival redoutable. Ils

croyaient se rencontrer sur le même terrain et, partant, se méprisaient. Destouches refusait à Dufresny le *bon sens*, Dufresny prétendait que Destouches n'avait pas d'*esprit*. En réalité ils ne se ressemblaient guère et la différence de leur talent a été mise au jour avec beaucoup de soin par D'Alembert dans son éloge de Destouches. On trouve chez Destouches la régularité du jardin français tandis que Dufresny a toute la fantaisie du parc anglais. Moins sérieux que Destouches, plus solide que Dancourt, Dufresny se trouve, sur le même plan, entre les deux. En profondeur il rejoint la comédie de Molière à une comédie toute différente et qui se croit absolument originale, la comédie de Marivaux. Ce n'est pas là le moindre mérite de l'auteur de *L'Esprit de Contradiction*, et les historiens de Marivaux le lui ont âprement disputé[1]. Pourquoi cette injustice, alors que Marivaux lui-même, franc comme l'était Dufresny, prononce le nom de Dufresny avec déférence ?

Marivaux avait trouvé en Dufresny un esprit altéré d'indépendance, profondément original et fier de l'être. Lorsque Dufresny avait débuté au théâtre, deux influences y dominaient ; celle de Molière, et celle de l'opéra. Dès sa première comédie, *Le Négligent*, Dufresny s'attaque délibérément aux deux. Il parodie l'opéra sur la scène des Italiens.

'Molière, s'écrie-t-il, Molière a bien gâté le théâtre. Si l'on donne dans son goût ; bon, dit aussitôt le critique, cela est pillé, c'est Molière tout pur; s'en écarte-t-on un peu: oh! ce n'est pas Molière!' Marivaux dut savoir gré à Dufresny de ces paroles et tous deux se rencontrèrent dans un irrespect, nécessaire à la vie de la comédie.

Mais il y eut d'autres points de contact. Cet esprit si original de Dufresny, cette gaîté qui provoque peu le rire éclatant, n'est-ce pas un avant-goût de Marivaux ? Tous deux s'adressent plutôt aux délicats. Il y a aussi chez Dufresny une pointe de romanesque et un certain tour précieux qui contrastent singulièrement avec le réalisme de Dancourt ou la folle gaîté de Regnard. Il y a dans l'analyse des sentiments de ses personnages, des nuances qui échappent au regard, une subtilité toute nouvelle. Il y a enfin dans son dialogue un peu de recherche mêlée de beaucoup de naturel, un certain besoin de néologisme, et, il faut l'avouer, un peu de finasserie et d'affectation. N'est-ce pas là ce qu'on trouvera dans le marivaudage ? Il ne faudrait pas dire que Dufresny pût être mis à côté de Marivaux, mais bien plutôt qu'il a l'honneur au XVII^e^ siècle d'annoncer un des auteurs qu'on s'accorde à trouver les plus heureusement originaux.

[1] 'Les contemporains de Marivaux lui faisaient trop d'honneur en le comparant volontiers à Marivaux.' Cf. Larroumet, *Marivaux*.

Il suffit pour s'en rendre compte de lire les Scènes v et XIX de *L'Esprit de Contradiction.*

Les contemporains, eux, ne s'y trompèrent pas, car un journal critique[1] jugea ainsi la *Vie de Marianne* à son apparition: 'Si le nom de M. de Marivaux ne paraissait pas au-devant de ces Mémoires, on les prendraient pour un ouvrage posthume de Dufresny. C'est la même manière de conter, vive, légère, courte et gaie; des expressions employées d'une manière nouvelle, mais agréable; le même art d'amener la morale et de la faire goûter; des réflexions justes et fines sur les mœurs du siècle, des portraits bien frappés.'

Style personnel et piquant, observations fines et justes, quelque chose du marivaudage: Voilà bien ce qu'on trouve chez Dufresny, quinze ans avant Marivaux.

Il faut donc redonner au nom de Dufresny la place qu'il doit occuper dans l'histoire de la littérature: c'est un anneau nécessaire de la chaîne qui relie Molière à Marivaux. Peut-être alors le relira-t-on. Piqué, étonné par l'allure originale de l'homme et de son œuvre, on regardera cette œuvre de plus près. On savourera comme ils le méritent, la verve de son style, la vérité et l'imprévu de ses observations, la richesse et l'ingénuité de ses idées dramatiques. On verra que si dans sa vie, comme dans son œuvre, il a manqué de cette volonté patiente qui couve, règle, cordonne, organise, il avait en lui l'étoffe d'un excellent écrivain. Et cela vaut bien qu'on ne l'oublie pas tout à fait.

ÉDOUARD FANNIÈRE.

OXFORD.

On trouvera ci-contre une bibliographie très succincte des œuvres de Dufresny:

Œuvres, recueillies par d'Alençon, Paris, Briasson, 1731 (6 vol. in-12). [Cette édition, réimprimée en 1747, est la seule à peu près complète que nous ayons des œuvres de Dufresny. Néanmoins elle ne contient pas les pièces écrites pour le théâtre italien; on les trouvera dans le *Théâtre Italien* de Gherardi.]

Œuvres, publiées par Barrois l'aîné, Paris, 1779 (4 vol. in-12).

Œuvres choisies de Dufresny (précédées d'une notice sur sa vie par Auger), F. Didot, Paris, 1801.

Le tome II des 'Chefs-d'œuvre des Auteurs comiques,' F. Didot, Paris, 1879, contient quatre des plus importantes pièces de Dufresny: L'esprit de contradiction—Le double veuvage—La coquette du village—Le mariage fait et rompu.

Théâtre choisi publié par G. d'Heylli, Paris, 1882, et précédé d'une introduction sur la vie et l'œuvre de l'auteur.

[1] *Le Journal littéraire de la Haye* (t. XXII).

Gherardi, Théâtre italien, Tome 6, Paris, 1741, 8°.

Entretiens ou amusements sérieux et comiques, Paris, 1699.

Les mêmes, édités par D. Jouaust, Paris, 1869, in-16. [Réimpression de l'édition publiée à Amsterdam chez E. Roger, en 1705.]

Les mêmes, édition accompagnée d'une traduction anglaise, la Haye, 1719.

Le Mercure Galant, de 1710 à 1715.

(Pour plus amples détails, cf. Guérard, La France littéraire.)

Sur Dufresny, cf. :

Les frères Parfaict, Histoire du Théâtre Français (en particulier le tome xv, p. 14).

La Harpe, Cours de Littérature.

D'Alembert, Eloge de Destouches.

C. Lénient, La Comédie en France au xviii^e^ siècle, Paris, Hachette, 1888 (t. i, p. 100).

J. Lemaître, La Comédie après Molière et le Théâtre de Dancourt.

Petit de Julleville, Histoire de la Littérature Française, vi, pp. 564 ff.

Lintilhac, Le Théâtre en France, vol. 4.

É. F.

ALLUSIONS IN 'ADONAIS' TO THE POEMS OF KEATS.

Mr W. M. Rossetti, in his notes to the seventeenth stanza of *Adonais*, writes: 'It is possible...that Shelley singled out the nightingale for mention in recognition of the consummate beauty of Keats's *Ode to the Nightingale*, published in the same volume with *Hyperion*,' and adds that 'the epithet "lorn" may also be noted in the same connexion; as Keats's Ode terminates with a celebrated passage in which "forlorn" is the leading word (but not as an epithet for the nightingale itself)—

Forlorn!—the very word is as a knell, etc.'

Confirmation of this view is obtained on examination of the context of Shelley's poem. I quote the relevant stanzas.

14

All he had loved, and moulded into thought
From shape, and hue, and odour, and sweet sound,
Lamented Adonais. Morning sought
Her eastern watch-tower, and her hair unbound,
Wet with the tears which should adorn the ground,
Dimmed the aerial eyes that kindle day;
Afar the melancholy thunder moaned,
Pale Ocean in unquiet slumber lay,
And the wild winds flew round, sobbing in their dismay.

15

Lost Echo sits amid the voiceless mountains,
And feeds her grief with his remembered lay,
And will no more reply to winds or fountains,
Or amorous birds perched on the young green spray,
Or herdsman's horn, or bell at closing day;
Since she can mimic not his lips, more dear
Than those for whose disdain she pined away
Into a shadow of all sounds:—a drear
Murmur, between their songs, is all the woodmen hear.

16

Grief made the young Spring wild, and she threw down
Her kindling buds, as if she Autumn were,
Or they dead leaves; since her delight is flown,
For whom should she have waked the sullen year?
To Phoebus was not Hyacinth so dear,
Nor to himself Narcissus, as to both
Thou, Adonais; wan they stand and sere
Amid the faint companions of their youth,
With dew all turned to tears; odour, to sighing ruth.

17

Thy spirit's sister, the lorn nightingale,
Mourns not her mate with such melodious pain;
Not so the eagle, who like thee could scale
Heaven, and could nourish in the sun's domain
Her mighty youth with morning, doth complain
Soaring and screaming round her empty nest,
As Albion wails for thee: the curse of Cain
Light on his head who pierced thy innocent breast,
And scared the angel soul that was its earthly guest!

In introducing personifications of the Powers of Nature and creatures of the woodland as lamenting the death of Adonais, Shelley follows the precedents of Moschus, four lines of whose *Lament over Bion* he prefixed as a motto to his poem, and of Bion himself, from whose *Lament over Adonis* he probably derived the name of Adonais. The question is what determined Shelley's choice of the mourners whom he names, and whether there is any special reason to believe that he associated them with Keats's poems. A clue to the answer is given in the opening words of stanza 14: 'All he had loved and moulded into thought...lamented Adonais.' With this encouragement it seems worth while to examine the poems of Keats in some detail.

The mourners are Morning, accompanied by Thunder, Ocean and Winds (st. 14), Echo (st. 15), Spring (st. 16), Hyacinth and Narcissus (st. 16), and Albion, whose mourning wail is compared with the Nightingale and Eagle (st. 17).

Of the first of these, Morning, there are four personifications in Keats's poem:

(*a*) In the first poem of his early volume ('I stood tiptoe, etc.'), the buds on the trees are said not yet to have lost

their starry diadems
Caught from the early sobbing of the morn;

(*b*) In the first sonnet of the early volume (*To my brother George*) he describes first among 'the wonders' he that day had seen

The sun, when first he kist away the tears
That fill'd the eyes of Morn;

(*c*) In the *Imitation of Spenser* published in the same volume Morning is said to come 'from her orient chamber,'

> And her first footsteps touch'd a verdant hill;

(*d*) In *Endymion* (iii, 113) the hero lay half-entranced under the ocean until Aurora's hand lifted 'the rosy veils mantling the east'...

> and sober'd morning came
> Meekly through billows.

The simile of the first two passages, (*a*) and (*b*), is recalled by Shelley's line:

> Wet with the tears which should adorn the ground,

and there is a certain likeness between the third passage, (*c*), and the 'eastern watch-tower' which 'Morning sought.' The fourth passage, (*d*), is one of three passages in *Endymion* selected by Shelley for special commendation in his letter to the editor of the *Quarterly Review* (Letter xliii), written shortly before the death of Keats (but never sent). Thus internal and external evidence alike suggest that Keats's references to Morning were present in Shelley's thoughts when he wrote the earlier half of stanza 14.

There is not the same evidence for the other three personifications in this stanza. Winds and Thunder, as might be expected, are in close juxtaposition in more than one passage of Keats, and both are definitely personified by him. In *Endymion* (iii, 652) there is 'muttering of winds morose' and (iii, 952) the rebel tempests of Æolus make 'gruff complaint'; and in *Hyperion* (i, 61) the

> thunder, conscious of the new command,
> Rumbles reluctant.

But none of these passages is recalled by Shelley's words.

Mr Rossetti notes that 'Ocean is personated in' stanza 14: 'he is a cosmic deity, lying pale in unquiet slumber.' But he seems to find some difficulty in accounting for the introduction of Ocean here; for he says 'not only the real Keats but also the figurative Adonais died in Rome,' where the ocean is not 'a feature in the immediate scene: it lies in the not very remote distance, felt rather than visible to sight.' But a reader of Keats will remember that the Ocean is among the wonders named in the sonnet (*To my brother George*) which speaks of the tears in the eyes of Morn; that Ocean appears as a cosmic deity in *Hyperion*; and that the Ocean is personified in Glaucus (*Endymion*, iii, 193) in whose 'cloak of blue' was woven

every ocean-form
. . . . . storm,
And calm, and whispering, and hideous roar
. . . . . with every shape
That skims, or dives, or sleeps, twixt cape and cape.

This passage of *Endymion* is the last of the three specially commended by Shelley to the notice of the editor of the *Quarterly Review*.

In tracing the source of allusions in Shelley's poem, we must not forget the two Greek poems upon which it is in part founded, the *Elegies* of Bion and Moschus. Neither of those poems indeed introduces any of the mourners of stanza 14. Echo, however, the mourner of stanza 15, appears in both, as well as in the poems of Keats. In Bion's poem she resounds to the cry that Adonis is dead. In Moschus's poem she no longer mimics the voice of Bion but laments his silence and remembers his songs. In *Endymion* (i, 947) Echo is described as inhabiting a cell amid woods beside a stream.

The 'young Spring' of stanza 16 is no doubt primarily brought in by the date of Keats's death, which occurred on February 23, though the precise date was not known to Shelley when he wrote *Adonais*. Both in Bion and in Moschus the 'flowers are faded,' but neither Greek poet mentions leaves, Spring or Autumn. In the *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, Keats writes of the

happy happy boughs! that cannot shed
Your leaves, nor ever bid the Spring adieu,

and the songs of Spring are contrasted with the music of Autumn in his poem *To Autumn*.

Next come Hyacinth and Narcissus, the two youths who in Greek legend were changed after death into flowers. Allusion has already been made in stanza 15 to Narcissus, the youth beloved by Echo, 'for whose disdain she pined away'; here, in stanza 16, Hyacinth and Narcissus are presented in both aspects, as young men, and as flowers of the Spring:

wan they stand and sere
Amid the faint companions of their youth,
With dew all turned to tears, odour, to sighing ruth.

Both legends are told by Keats. In the first poem of the first volume ('I stood tiptoe' etc.) he tells the story of

Narcissus pining o'er the untainted spring,

and how

on the bank a lonely flower he spied.

The story of Hyacinth is twice referred to in *Endymion*, allusively by the 'Indian Lady' (iv, 68) who wishes

> That woodland Hyacinthus could escape
> From his green prison,

and earlier (i, 326) where the quoit-pitching recalls

> the sad death
> Of Hyacinthus, when the cruel breath
> Of Zephyr slew him,—Zephyr penitent,
> Who now, ere Phoebus mounts the firmament,
> Fondles the flower amid the sobbing rain.

Moschus introduces the hyacinth flower with its graven letters, but makes no mention of the human Hyacinthus, and Narcissus is not mentioned by either Moschus or Bion.

The figure of Albion, in the next stanza, recalls the lamentations of Lesbos for Alcaeus, and of Mitylene for Sappho, in the poem of Moschus. Her wailing is compared by Shelley with the mourning of the nightingale, 'thy spirit's sister,' and with the complaint of the eagle,

> who like thee could scale
> Heaven, and could nourish in the sun's domain
> Her mighty youth with morning.

Mr Rossetti's suggestion that Shelley chose the nightingale in recognition of the beauty of Keats's *Ode* may be reinforced by two considerations. In the first place Keats's frequent references—there are eleven, besides the *Ode*—show that he had a special admiration for the nightingale's song. One of these (*End.*, i, 831) follows, as Shelley does in *Adonais*, the classical precedent which makes the bird feminine, and departs, as Shelley does, from the classical story of Philomel, by making the bird sing to her mate:

> . . . . . bless
> The world with benefits unknowingly;
> As does the nightingale, up-perched high,
> And cloister'd among cool and bunched leaves—
> She sings but to her love, nor e'er conceives
> How tiptoe Night holds back her dark-grey hood.

In the next place Shelley has himself indicated that when he wrote *Adonais*, the *Ode to the Nightingale* was not far from his thoughts, for in his preface to *Adonais* he describes the Protestant Cemetery of Rome, where Keats was buried, in words directly reminiscent of the sixth stanza of Keats's poem: 'It might make one in love with death, to think that one should be buried in so sweet a place.'

The eagle also seems to have been a special favourite of Keats. There are sixteen references to the eagle in his poems, ten of them being in *Endymion*. The opening of Neptune's palace gates (iii, 859, 860) made the dazzled onlookers

> veil their eyes
> Like callow eagles at the first sunrise,

till

> Soon with an eagle nativeness their gaze
> . . . . . took all the blaze.

But the nearest parallel to Shelley's words is earlier in the poem (ii, 635), where Endymion, who has been

> Vex'd like a morning eagle, lost and weary,

is carried by an eagle to the jasmine bower where he finds the 'known Unknown.'

As with Albion, so with the birds, Shelley has followed to some extent the precedent of Moschus. Moschus compares the songs of Bion with the singing of the nightingale and of the sea-bird, and their lamentation over Bion with that of the birds, Memnonides, over Memnon from whom they took their name. But Shelley, while keeping the nightingale of the Greek poet, has introduced the eagle, both these birds having, as I think, special associations for him with Keats. If this is so, if he has introduced into the elegy on Keats allusions to things made lovely by the poet whose death he laments, he has again followed the precedent of Moschus. For Moschus names as flowers which—in Bion's own phrase—are to 'redden in sorrow' the windflowers which in Bion's poem spring from the blood of Adonis and the tears of Aphrodite.

MARGARET DE G. VERRALL.

CAMBRIDGE.

'COMMENCEMENT' AND 'COMMISSARY.'

THE *New English Dictionary* gives under the headings 'Commence' v., 'Commencement' sb., the general and original sense of 'beginning,' and, as a special application, 'graduating at a University.' The two words were since the early years of the Middle Ages, and are still in general use throughout the Romance languages in the sense of 'beginning.' In the sense of 'graduating,' the words 'commence,' 'commencement' are peculiar to English. An examination of the authorities quoted in the *New English Dictionary* seems to indicate that we have to do with two distinct stems or groups of words, which (presumably in the South of France) were blended together at an early date, before the fourteenth, and possibly before the thirteenth century.

'Commence' v., 'to begin,' is derived from the Med. Latin 'cominitiare' (com- [intensive] + initiare), 'cominciare,' 'comenciare,' 'to begin.' 'Commencement' sb. is a noun of action based on the verb and derived from the Med. Latin 'comenciamentum,' 'beginning.' In France, 'comencer,' with one *m*, was the regular way of spelling till the thirteenth century; in England, both words, when meaning 'beginning,' were before the sixteenth century commonly spelled with one *m*,—although the form 'commencement' ('beginning') occurs as early as 1250.

Of 'commencement' in the sense of 'graduating' the *New English Dictionary* says that the word denotes, 'The action of taking the full degree of Master or Doctor; esp. at Cambridge, Dublin and the American universities, the great ceremony when these (also in some cases other degrees, esp. in U.S., that of Bachelor) are conferred, at the end of the academical year.' A quotation of the year 1587 (Harrison, *England*, II [1877], 175) informs us that in Oxford this 'solemnitie' was then called an Act, 'but in Cambridge they vse the French word Commensement.'

Turning to 'Act' sb., we learn from the quotations that 'Acts' (which usually took place half a year after the preliminary ceremony of the 'License') were kept at Cambridge as well as at Oxford; the word

denoted the public maintaining of a thesis by the licentiate with a following disputation under the supervision of his former master and in presence of the masters and scholars of the University, after which the doctorandus had the biretta (magisterial cap) placed upon his head and received the book (the Bible) and the kiss of fellowship, and took his seat on the cathedra. We see, then, that as early as in 1587 the term 'Commensement' as the name of a ceremony was unknown at Oxford, and that at Cambridge it denoted, like the word 'Act,' the public disputation together with the bestowing of the magisterial insignia and the reception into the fellowship of doctors, that is to say, the ceremonial graduation. A hundred years later, we find the word 'Commencement' when denoting 'graduation' replaced by the word 'Inception.' We find a jest based on the double sense of the word as early as 1597, Shakspere 2 *Henry IV*: 'Learning [is] a mere Hoord of Gold...till Sack commences it, and sets it in act and vse.'

The *Encyclopædia Britannica* of 1888 ('Universities,' p. 835) says: 'By Inception was implied the master's formal entrance upon, and commencement of, the functions of a duly licensed teacher, and his recognition as such by his brothers in the profession.' His first lecture, the beginning of his career as a 'duly licensed' teacher, need not have been identical with his public disputation and was certainly subsequent to his graduation or recognition. We learn from some quotations in the *New English Dictionary*, given below, that in the seventeenth century the term 'Inception' was used interchangeably with 'Commencement' in the sense of 'graduation.'

The earliest authority quoted for 'commencement' as a University term is Trevisa, *Higden* (Rolls) II. 259, of 1387: 'By a Statute of the universite of Oxenford whan eny man is i-congyed' (licensed) 'þere to commence in eny faculte, he schal not spende at his comencement passynge þre þowsand of grootes turonens' (3,000 Touraine groats, equal to about £50).

About the year 1387, therefore, we find a 'com(m)encement' as an event of the curriculum at Oxford as well as at Cambridge. 'Act' and 'Commencement' must originally have been two different events, leading up to, and each of them required for, the full degree (not the lesser degrees). This is also indicated by a passage in Fletcher's *Elder Brother*, of the year 1625: 'Come, doctor Andrew, without disputation, Thou shalt commence i' th' cellar.'

The passage quoted from Trevisa indicates that there was an occasion for the doctorandus 'at his comencement' to spend lavishly,

and even so much of a temptation to do so, that the University found it necessary to pass a special sumptuary law restricting the expenditure. It is difficult to see how the public disputation, the receiving of the Bible and the biretta, or the kiss of fellowship could afford any such occasion.

The medieval 'Act' opened with the statement of a thesis at a public meeting of the masters and scholars, the maintaining of the thesis by the doctorandus first by direct argument and then against all comers by disputation; its modern counterpart is the 'examen rigorosum.' The second part of the 'Act' consisted of the ceremony of investing and seating the doctorandus, of his actual 'graduation': he received 'the book,' the biretta was placed upon his head; thereupon he 'received the kiss of fellowship' from the other masters and doctors and was seated upon the cathedra. He was now a master (or doctor) fully recognized. The ceremony was practically the same as the enthronization of the bishop and as the coronation of the king of England. The new king—he is king as yet only by the rule, 'Le roy est mort, vive le roy!'—in presence of the peers of the kingdom is vested with the royal vestments by the bishops and receives sceptre and mound, has the royal crown placed upon his head by the Primate, bestows upon the bishops the 'kiss of peace' and is seated upon the royal throne, whereupon he receives the homage of the peers of his realm[1]. He is now the crowned and enthroned and fully recognized king; so far, he has received, and it is now his turn to give: he entertains the peers at a ceremonial feast, and shows himself bountiful to his assembled people; the banquet closes the coronation ceremonies.

We find in the *New English Dictionary* some suggestive quotations of the year 1680 under the heading of 'Inception' sb.: Wood *Ann.* (ed. Gutch, 1792), 'After he had feasted the Scholars at his Inception, they like clownes left him.'...'There was no scholar, if of any account, but did show himself bountiful at his Inception.'

What did the words 'at his comencement (Inception)' originally mean?

I think we have here a plain reference to what was universally known in those centuries at the Continental Universities of Europe as an essential and as the most expensive—and for impecunious scholars

[1] The 'kiss of peace' and also the 'kiss of fellowship' may originally have been expressions of thanks for the attendance and assistance given at the ceremony of the coronation by the bishops, or at graduation by the doctors. It seems that the similarity of the two ceremonies was felt as late as 1689, when at the coronation of William and Mary the 'receiving of the book' was introduced.

the most burdensome and often a prohibitive—part of the exercises leading up to the full degree, namely, the ceremonial banquet. See, for instance, Goethe, *Faust*, Paktszene:

'Ich werde heute gleich beim *Doktorschmaus*
Als Diener meine Pflicht erfüllen.'

The 'Commensement' was the feast given by the new doctor to the masters and scholars, to the assembly which attended and took part in the 'Act,' the public disputation; it may be presumed that they stayed together for the subsequent banquet, the 'commensement.'

For the gradual extension of this sense of the word 'commensement' we find evidence in a quotation of the year 1593 (Nashe, *Four Letters Confut.*): 'Shewe mee the Vniuersities hand and seale that thou art a Doctour sealed and deliuered in the presence of a whole Commensement.' The word seems to denote here either the 'University' or the 'Faculty' (see Trevisa), the whole 'company assembled at the delivery of the diploma as well as the feast.'

The passage indicates that the magisterial diploma was delivered at the banquet, 'at the Commensement.' It suggests that about the year 1590 the diploma had in England the character of a deed. In the Middle Ages, the graduation was completed by the seating of the doctorandus upon the cathedra, and the diploma was merely evidence of the fact that the 'Act' had taken place. It seems that at some time in the history of Cambridge University the individual banquets of the new doctors (perhaps in order to restrict the expense) were merged into a general magisterial banquet given by all the new Masters and Doctors together at the end of the academical year, and that at that banquet the diplomas were distributed; by and by, the banquet shrank into oblivion, and the delivery of the diplomas became the principal and finally the sole event of the ceremony. I conclude therefore that, about 1587 to 1593, 'Act' denoted in England the ceremonial graduation, and 'Commensement' was used at Cambridge for 'the delivery of the diploma'; the diploma having assumed the character of a deed, 'Commensement' came to denote at Cambridge the actual graduation, 'the conferring of the (full) degree.' Compare Parke tr. Mendoza's *Hist. China*, XIV, 95 (of the year 1588): 'To commence or graduate such students as haue finished their course.'... 'The day appointed...for to commence or giue degrees.'

The magisterial banquet was still in vogue at that time everywhere. What were the vernacular words denoting it in the Middle Ages at Oxford and at Cambridge and at Dublin? And what were the French

terms for it at Paris, and what in the countries of the Langue d'oc? And what Latin words were used for it at the different universities and high schools?

If the above derivation is correct, the academical use of the word 'commensement' would be a special application of its general meaning: '(the company assembled at) a ceremonial banquet.' For the use of the word in that sense we have a record, though of late date: 1563—87, Foxe *Actes and Monuments* (1596) 162/1, 'The princes of Almanie assembled a Commensement, where they did consult and so conclude to elect another emperor.' This quotation suggests that the original sense of the word may have been 'eating together at the same table,' and, derived from it, 'a feast,' 'a ceremonial banquet'; 'the assembly gathered for a ceremonial banquet.'

If this is correct, the word 'commensement' must have passed (possibly between the fifth and the twelfth century) through an evolution similar to that of '*συμπόσιον*' sb. in ancient times and much like that of the word 'parliament' sb. That word is based on the Anglo-Latin 'parliamentum' of the thirteenth century, derived from 'par(o)lare (parabolare)' v., 'to discourse, talk.' 'Parliamentum,' 'parlement' in French, meant (1) the action of speaking; a 'spell' or 'bout' of speaking; (2) a formal conference or council for some matter of general importance; specially, it was the name applied in the early times of the French monarchy to the assembly of the great lords of the kingdom.

As the quotations show, the word now spelt 'commencement' was spelt in the later years of the Middle Ages, when it denoted 'graduating,' promiscuously 'commensement,' 'commencement' or 'comencement'; but 'commensement' seems to have been the commonest form. This spelling would lead up to a Medieval Latin noun 'commensamentum,' based on a verb 'commensare,' 'to commense,' 'to feast.'

I have found no record of the verbal form[1]. It may be that the word has survived as a substantive in the phrase of the Essex and Sussex dialects, 'Here's a pretty commence!' which is or was equivalent to 'Here's a pretty mess!' But the earliest quotation known of that phrase seems to be of the year 1794 (Southey, *Letters*).

We find in Provençal at the time of the trobadors, about 1160 to 1230, two groups of verbal forms meaning 'to begin': 'comenchar'

[1] Since this was written I have been informed by Mr G. C. Macaulay that the forms 'commensare' and 'commensacio' are found in the Cambridge University Grace-books (about 1474).

(Raimon Vidal de Bezaudun), 'comenhar,' 'comenzar' (Bertran de Born, 1180 to 1195), on one hand; and, on the other, 'comensar' (Peire Vidal), 'comesar' (*Prise Jér.*), 'comenssar' (Gaucelm Faidit, died 1216). Mistral (*Lou Tresor dóu Felibrige*, 1879) gives as the modern form 'coumença.' Should the old forms not be derived, respectively, from 'comenciare' v. and 'commensare' v.? And are not the forms 'comenssar,' 'comenzar' blendings of 'comensar' with 'comenchar'? The old forms of the noun in Provençal are 'comensamens' (Folquet de Marseille, about 1180), 'comensamen' (G. Magret). 'Comensament,' 'comenssament,' 'comessament,' are cited by Mistral; as modern forms he quotes 'coumençamen'; 'coumençoment,' 'beginning.' In Catalan it is 'comensament' sb. (Old Catalan and Provençal 'coméns,' sb. m.), 'beginning.' These forms plainly go back to 'commensamentum' sb. Italian, on the other side, in its literary speech has preserved unblended the forms derived from 'initiare' v., namely 'cominciare' v. (Dante, *Inferno*, about 1300), and 'cominciamento' sb. (Dante, *Convivio*, 1306–9; *Paradiso*). In the dialects of Northern Italy, however, we find forms approaching the Provençal: 'comenzar' v. in Venetian; in Bellunese, 'cominziar,' 'scomenzar' v.; in Milanese, 'comenzà' v. (Cherubini, 1839), 'comenciâ' v. (Angiolini, 1897), 'inzà,' 'ninzà' v. (Cherubini), from Latin in + initiare v.; Como: 'comenzà,' 'ininzà' v., in manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; in Genovese, 'insâ' v.; in Bresciano and Bergamasco, 'comensâ' v.; in Piemontese, 'comenssè' v. In Neapolitan, we find 'accommenzare' v., 'accommenzaglia' sb.; in Sicilian, 'accuminzari' v., 'iniziari' v., and 'accuminzagghia' sb. In Spanish it was until modern times 'començamiento' sb., from 'començar' v.; modern, 'comienzo' sb. (Med. Latin 'comencium'?), from 'comenzar' v.

In French, we find, according to Littré, in the tenth century 'comencier' v.; eleventh century, 'cumencer' v.; twelfth century, 'commencier,' 'comencer,' 'commencer' v.; thirteenth century, 'commencher,' 'commencier,' 'commencer' v. In Bourguignon, it was 'quemancé' v.

That the verb 'commensare,' 'to feast,' did exist in early Medieval Latin, is shown by a noun of action based on it, 'commensation'; the earliest record of the latter, however, is of late date, 1682 (1645). The *New English Dictionary* gives as its meaning 'eating at the same table.' In support of this it quotes from Sir Thomas Browne, *Tracts* (1682): 'When Daniel would pollute himself with the diet of the Babylonians, he probably declined Pagan commensation, or to eat of meats forbidden to the Jews.' The 'Pagan commensation' forbidden to the early

Christians, to which reference is here apparently made, was not the mere eating at the same table with the 'Heathen,' but participation in the 'Pagan' feasts and banquets, where the meat of victims was consumed and sacrifice was offered to the emperors and other 'Pagan' gods; the religious ceremony of the feast was the ground of the prohibition. I think therefore that the passage quoted indicates that 'commensation' was used in the sense of 'feasting,' 'banqueting.'

It seems therefore likely that in France and England from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century two groups of words existed side by side, both spelt promiscuously 'commenser' (French), 'commense' (English) v., 'commensement' sb.; 'comencer' (French), 'comence' (English) v., 'comencement' sb.; 'commencer' (French), 'commence' (English) v., 'commencement' sb.; 'comenser' (French), 'comense' (English) v., 'comensement' sb. One of these words (the younger one) was originally spelt 'comence(r),' 'comencement,' and denoted originally 'beginning,' whereas the older word was originally spelt 'commense(r)' v., 'commensement' sb. and had originally the general meaning of 'feasting,' with special application in England to the magisterial banquet.

I think that we have traces of similar mixing of two different but like-sounding words in Provençal. The form 'comensazon' sb. (Rom.) (in Daurel; also *Crois. Alb.*, 7785, 7797) was used in the sense of 'beginning'; 'comensazon' seems to have been derived from 'commensatio' sb. rather than from 'comenciatio' sb. The same applies, respectively, to the Provençal forms 'comensansa' sb. fem. (Old Catalan 'comensenza'), Old Italian 'comincianza,' from a Latin form 'commensantia'; and 'comensailla' sb. fem., Old Italian 'cominciaglia,' Old French 'commenchaille,' from a Latin form 'commensalia,' all with the meaning of 'beginning.' The French 'commenchaille' suggests an early French verb 'comencher' (which later was changed to 'comencer'; see Provençal 'comenssar,' Spanish 'començar'); it may have been derived from 'comencialis' adj., based on 'comencium' sb. Old Italian had a form 'comincio' sb. m., 'beginning.' Provençal 'comensaire' sb. can scarcely be derived from anything else but Latin 'commensarius'; nor can the Provençal form 'comensador' sb., 'one who begins,' be based on anything but 'commensator.' The corresponding Italian forms are 'cominciatore,' 'cominciatrice' (Boccaccio, about 1350)[1].

[1] Compare 'degree' sb., French 'degré,' based on Provençal 'degrat,' 'degra,' which was derived from Late Popular Latin 'dēgrad-um' ('dē,' down + 'gradus,' step), 'a step downward (or upward).' 'Grad-um' sb. (step) and 'grat-um' adj. (pleasant) were blended

The verb 'commenser,' in the sense 'to feast,' must have disappeared from French at an early date. If it has been obliterated by its more common homonym 'comencer' v., 'to begin,' the double *m* which appeared in the latter in the thirteenth century may well be a vestige of the lost word. But another question arises now: if it is correct that the words 'comence,' 'comencement' came to England from France, and passed into French from the Langue d'oc at a time when the blending had already taken place, there must have been some other potent factor in England which resisted the introduction of that second *m* for generations and which kept alive the words 'commense,' 'commensement' in their original sense of 'feasting.' Was that factor the common use of the Latin tongue among professional men in England? The use of Latin was as common in France as in England. Or was it some other foreign influence, coming from some scholarly country (Ireland?) which was outside of the influence of the Langue d'oc? In fact, the word 'commensamentum' must have been known in England in the sense of 'feasting' before the introduction of the Provençal blend for 'beginning,' else it could not have survived.

Littré's earliest quotation of 'commencement' is taken from Couci, the 'trouvère,' who died about the year 1200; he also quotes 'el commenchement,' thirteenth century; he gives as of the twelfth century the phrase 'au commencier' from Couci, equivalent to the modern 'au commencement.' Littré mentions as Old French forms, 'commencence' sb., and 'commensaille' sb. Dante uses in the *Inferno* the verbal substantive 'lo cominciare' for 'beginning'; in his later works, *Convivio* and *Paradiso*, he does use 'cominciamento,' but only a few times. The *Vocabolario della Crusca* (1878 ed.) quotes as the earliest use of 'cominciamento': 'il cominciamento del savere' in a translation of Albertano's *Tre Trattati*, written between 1235 and 1246 and translated 'nei medesimi tempi in volgar fiorentino'; and, 'el cominciamento e l' uscita' in Giamboni's translation of the *Tesoro*, written in France and in French about 1270 by Brunetto Latini (a Florentine, who lived long in Paris, 'eccellente scrittore francese'). The *Crusca* does not give any of the other substantive forms of the Provençal. It seems possible that 'cominciamento' was an importation from the French, adapted by Giamboni to the Italian verbal form then in common use. The Provençals used, in the sense of 'beginning,' the Med. Latin forms 'commensamentum,' 'commensatio,' 'commensalia,' 'commensantia,'

together into the Provençal 'grat'; this passed into 'gré,' as the Latin 'amat-um' passed into 'aimé.'

'commensator' (Boccaccio studied the trobadors in early life), 'commensarius.' If 'cominciamento' was the French 'commencement' in Italian dress, the use of these forms in the sense of 'beginning' must have originated in the Langue d'oc, and not in Italian. It seems also significant that a 'trouvère' is the earliest known user of the word in France, and that was as late as the end of the twelfth century.

'Commensation' sb. is referred in the *New English Dictionary* to 'commensalis' adj., which originally meant 'belonging to the same table'; in a derived sense, it meant 'eating at the same table'; 'companion,' 'conviva.' It was used as a noun at an early date, as appears from the quotations in the Du Cange *Glossarium* (1842 ed.), and was employed as a title and a dignity in or before the twelfth century and throughout the Middle Ages. 'Commensalia' was in the ninth century or earlier ('Isidorus Mercator,' Falsus, *Corpus Canonum Hispaniense*, known since 852) the Vulgar Latin name of the 'contributions to the common table' of the early Christians. The Du Cange *Glossarium* gives an instance of early date (Atto, Langobard bishop of Vercelli, about the year 950), where the form 'commessalia' is used instead of the normal 'commensalia' in the sense of 'contributions.' We find the same variation in the Provençal 'comessament' sb., and in Portuguese, 'começo' sb., 'começar' v., meaning 'to begin.' The same variation of sound, 'commessation' for 'commensation,' appears in an English quotation of the *New English Dictionary* dated 1645 (Howell, *Letters*): 'Ther could be no true frendship without commessation of a bushell of salt.' See also tr. Bouhours' *St Ignatius*, of the year 1686: 'The Agapes, or Commessations of the Primitive Christians.'

The *New English Dictionary* associates 'commessation' sb. with 'comessation' sb.; the latter was derived from the Latin 'comessatio' sb., which in its turn was derived from 'comessari' v., a variation of the Classical Latin 'comissari' v. (from '*κῶμος*'), 'to celebrate a Bacchanal,' 'to carouse, revel,' 'to banquet.' The quotations from Atto, Howell and Bouhours seem to indicate that 'commessation' was merely a variation of the normal form 'commensation.'

On the other hand, it is also possible that, in the sense of 'to feast,' 'commensare,' 'commessare' v. was superseded by the Medieval Latin verb 'comessare (comesare),' the frequentative of 'comedere' v., 'to eat.' This is indicated by a passage in Wyclif's Sermons (*Select Works*, II 224) of the year 1380: 'Sich ofte etingis of men ben clepid commessaciouns.' It may be that the alteration of 'comissari' v. to 'comessari' was caused by its association with 'comessare' v., 'to eat frequently (and

well).' If 'commensare' v. was superseded by a word derived either from 'comissari' v. or from 'comesare' v., we find again the influence of the obliterated word in the doubling of the *m*.

I know of no record of the verbal forms 'comessare,' 'comesare.' But the Du Cange *Glossarium* records (under the heading 'Comestores') some forms directly derived from 'comesare' v., namely, 'comesator,' and 'comesatio.' 'Comesare (comessare)' v. seems to have been obliterated early in the Renaissance by 'comessari (comissari)' v. The past participle of 'comedere' v., viz., 'comesus,' 'comessus,' was used in Late Latin in the sense of 'lacerated.' 'Esus' sb. is used in the year 1342 for 'breakfast.' A parallel form is also recorded by Du Cange in Tertullian: 'Mus comesor, qui comedit.'

To the same stem belongs the word 'comesarius' sb., for which the Du Cange *Glossarium* gives the definition: 'Officium monasticum, cui ciborum cura est demandata.' It cites an authority of the year 1290: (Tom. 7 *Ordinat. reg. Franc.* p. 615, art. 29), 'Quod illos (illi) reditus quos habent in castro, monasterii sacrista et comesarius et eleemosinarius, remaneant semper salvi,' 'Let the income which the sexton, the commissary and the almoner of the monastery (minster?) have in the borough, ever remain inviolate.'

This is the Modern English word 'commissary' sb. (Mil.). The *New English Dictionary* derives the word from Medieval Latin 'commissarius' (from 'commissum' sb., 'committere' v.), and gives as its sense (Mil.): 'an officer or official who has charge of the supply of food, stores, and transport, for a body of soldiers.' It quotes Caxton, *Faytes of Arms*, of the year 1489: 'There shal be wyse comyssaryes that gode hede shal take that for couetyse of the payement of the souldyours noo decepcion be made.' See also *Nomina Dignitatum Clericorum*, in Wright-Wülker, 680/37, about the year 1450: 'Hic comissarius, comyssari.' The form 'comissarius' sb. seems to have been associated in the fifteenth century with the Latin verb 'comissari.'

The Du Cange quotation of the year 1290 taken from the Ordinances of the Kings of France traces the English words 'commissary' (Mil.), 'commissariat,' two hundred years farther back, into the monastic life of France.

F. F. VON WILMOWSKY.

NEW YORK.

[Note. At the suggestion of the author of the above paper I add a note on the use of the words 'commensare' and 'commensacio' in the Cambridge Grace-book A. They are not of regular occurrence, but in the Proctors' accounts for the year 1474–5 we have the following fines recorded:

Item pro caucione Magistri Frank quia non commensauit infra annum iij^{li} vij^{s} v^{d}.
Item pro caucione Magistri Bellamy quia non commensauit infra annum xl^{s}.
Item pro caucione Magistri Dallyng quia non commensauit infra annum xl^{s}.

More commonly 'incipere' is used, apparently with the same meaning, as 1456–7:

Item receptum de magistro Derewarde quia non incepit infra annum sue admissionis v^{li}.

Under the year 1470–1 we have this:

Item a doctore Fratre Haward die commensacionis sue scil. in festo sanctorum processi et martiniani quia non conuiuauit v^{li} vj^{s} viij^{d}.

This is a commutation in respect of the feast, and occurs rather often in the case of friars, e.g. 1456–7:

Item de fratre Walkfelde pro non conuiuando xl^{s};

and 1458–9:

Item de fratre Roberto Chabyrlein quia non conuiuauit regentes xl^{s}.

But also in other cases, e.g. 1462–3:

Item receptum a doctore Cambryge pro commutacione conuiuii v^{li} vj^{s} viij^{d}.

G. C. Macaulay.]

EIN NEUES BRUCHSTÜCK AUS DER 'ROSE' HEINRICS VAN AKEN.

Vor einiger Zeit übergab mir Sir George F. Warner das unten abgedruckte Bruchstück—nun Add. 38,091 P—welches sich unter anderen Fragmenten, sämtlich unbekannter Herkunft, vorgefunden hatte, zur Bestimmung. Es zeigte sich mir bald seine Zugehörigkeit zur *Rose* Heinrics van Aken (herausg. von E. Verwijs, 's Gravenhage, 1868), von der zwei vollständige und Bruchstücke dreier anderer Codices bekannt sind. Das Londoner Bruchstück entstammt keiner dieser drei zerschnittenen Handschriften, ist also der klägliche Überrest eines vierten und zwar ursprünglich sehr schönen und stattlichen mnl. Manuskripts. Davon repräsentiert das Erhaltene den unteren Streifen eines noch zusammenhängenden Pergament-Doppelblattes und stammt aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach aus einem Bucheinband. Streifen 1 misst noch: Höhe am linken Rand 6·8 cm., am rechten nur 5·2 cm., da die vermaledeite Buchbinderscheere einen Teil des unteren, ursprünglich 4·3 cm. hohen Blattrandes schräg abgeschnitten hat; die Breite beträgt 14·1 cm. Streifen 2: seine Höhe beträgt am linken Rande gemessen 6·9 cm., am rechten aus gleichem Grunde wie oben, nur 5·9 cm.; die Breite 16·4 cm. Der Breitenunterschied der beiden Streifen wird dadurch bedingt, dass der bei Streifen 2 gut erhaltene äussere Blattrand (2·4 cm.) bei Streifen 1 gänzlich der Scheere zum Opfer gefallen ist zugleich mit den Anfangsbuchstaben der Verse auf 1^{va}.

Diesen Doppelblattrest hat nun eine Hand, die noch in die erste Hälfte des vierzehnten Jh. zu setzen sein wird, mit klarer, etwas gerundeter gotischer Schrift beschrieben und zwar in zwei Spalten, innerhalb welcher die Verse abgesetzt stehen, so dass der grosse Anfangsbuchstabe eines jeden etwas herausgerückt ist. Als Schmuck finden sich noch, je einen neuen Abschnitt einführend, zwei rote, drei resp. zwei Zeilen hohe Initialen mit blauen, über die Ränder sich ausdehnenden Zierraten auf 1^{rb} und 2^{ra}, während sich der unterste, abgeschnittene Rest einer solchen nebst blauen Zierraten auf der Schnittfläche von 2^{vb} zeigt. Von irgend welcher Interpunktion weisen

die Bruchstücke keine Spur auf. Aus dem Umfang der Lücken zwischen den erhaltenen Versen lässt sich leicht berechnen, dass die vollständigen Spalten je 33, resp. 32 (auf Bl. 1^{v}) Verse umfasst haben müssen. Nun fehlen zwischen Bl. 1^{v} und Bl. 2^{r} 549 Verse d. h. so viele als bei entsprechendem Spaltenumfang (33—32 Zeilen) auf 4 Bll. gegangen wären: es ist also wahrscheinlich, dass unser Bruchstück einen Teil des äusseren Doppelblattes eines Quinio der zerschnittenen Handschrift repräsentiert.

Was endlich die Textgestalt anbetrifft, so stellt sich unser Fragment nahe zu A (der Amsterdamer Handschrift), jedoch besteht zwischen den beiden Zeugen keineswegs das direkte Verhältnis von Vorlage und Abschrift, vgl. die Lesarten zu V. 1840, 1874, 1906.

Ich lasse nun einen möglichst diplomatischen Abdruck der beiden Streifen folgen.

1ra (v. 1153) I c ſegge ſekerlec wel dat
D at den ioncfrouwen ſtaen uele bat
W itte kedele wel geploit
D an enech ander cleet dede noit
D ie witte kedel toende wel

1^{rb} (v. 1186) S ine warde heilen ēn breken
G erne dede hi den lied[en ere]
D ies mīnen ſine van hertē ſere
L edecheit die ſcone maget
Daer ic v uore af hebbe [geſaget]

1va (v. 1218) [B i] gode het mochte elkē luſtē
[T] e ſiene alſo ſoeten ſpel
[D] ie ionchere hi waſ oec wel
[V] an der ouder dat ſceen ſin
[J] oncheide ſijn ſoete m̄inekijn

1^{vb} (v. 1250) D ie daer ſtoden ſoe menegertirē
I c ſciet van daer ēn ginc allene
I n dat uergier daer groet ēn clene
H arde wale die uogle ſongen
S oete ēn ſcone na haren tongē

1157 *fehlt in* A.
1187 *die eingeklammerten Buchstaben sind durch einen Einriss ins Pergament zerstört.*
1190 geſaget] *muss, wenn nicht überhaupt ausgelassen, auf dem weggeschnittenen Aussenrande (s. oben) gestanden haben.*
1250 ſoe] *fehlt in* A *und* C (*Comburger Hs.*).

2ra (v. 1804) M aer int ſaluen was ſi ſachte
S i maecte in deen ſide wōden groet
D ieſe in dander ſide toe ſloet
T e mi wert quam hirē binnen
S ere uerſtormt die god vā mīnē

2rb (v. 1836) [V an dien die v noit ne ſagen]
D ies geuic v here hier ter ſtede
H erte eñ ſen ende dlijf mede
W ant ic noch hope den tijt te ſiene
D at mi van v ſtaet te geſciene
G oet eñ ere eñ alle genade

2va (v. 1869) . . g . . .
E ñ oec van ſoe groten name
W ant die baniere voert die mīne
D aer alle houeſcheit es inne
W ant ſi es van ſelker manierē
D at ſi es edel eñ goedertieren

2vb (v. 1903) E n wetti doch die waerheit wale
D at gi van mi hebt altemale
M ine herte geheel tuwen gebode
A l woudict enech ſens bi gode
V an v keren en holpe niet

1836 *nur die unteren Spitzen der Buchstabenschäfte und der grössere Teil des* g *erhalten.*
1840 f. A... staet goet te sciene | Goet ende
1869 *nur ganz geringe Spuren von* 5 *Buchstaben und der unterste Teil der* g *Schleife erhalten.*
1874 edel] hovesch AC.
1906 woudict] wildic AC.

ROBERT PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

CARL FRIEDRICH CRAMERS ZWEITE PETRARCAODE.

An das in der vorigen Nummer dieser Zeitschrift (S. 198) Gesagte anknüpfend, teile ich hier die andere Petrarcaode Cramers mit. Nach ihrem Platze in der Handschrift bezeichne ich die dort (S. 192 ff.) gedruckte Ode *Petrarch an Laura* fortan als '**12**' und die hier mitgeteilte als '**13.**'

[13] ODE.

Petrarch an Laura.

Heller als in dem Lenz, funkelte hoch herab
Von dem Himmel die Sonn, sandte voll Mildigkeit
Unsern schwankenden Saaten
Wärme, fruchtbare Wärme her.

Zwar es seufzte das Feld, dass schon der Frühling entflohn
Der mit Freuden erfüllt, alles was Leben hat,
Und in schattigten Hainen
Lechzten durstige Hindinnen.

Auch Philomele schwieg, klagte voll Zärtlichkeit
Ihrem Itys nicht nach, und in dem dunklern Laub
Wehte säuselnd kein Zephir
Der die glühende Wange kühlt.

Und doch war die Natur, in majestätischer Pracht,
Schön. Noch schöner ward sie als du o Laura tratst
Auf die lechzenden Fluren
Die durch dich ein Valhalla sind.

Eilend trug dich dein Fuss, hin zu der Sorgue Fluth,
Die mit silbernem Nass blumigt' Ufer bespült
Und durch schlängelnde Gänge
Durch mäandrische Krümmen flieht.

Da, da seztest du dich unter dem duftendem[1] Busch
Der balsamische Blüth', streut' auf die Blume der Welt
Ungern rauschte die Sorgue
Von dem schönsten der Füsse weg,

[1] Zu dieser grammatischen Eigentümlichkeit vgl. Muncker in *Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstocks Oden*, hrsg. v. Muncker u. Pawel, 1. Band, Stuttgart 1889, S. XIII. unten.

Der sie jemals betrat, und an dem weissestem Knie
Wie der blendende Schnee, weilte der Tropfen sich
Und floss später als andre
Zu der tönenden Rhone hin.

Schüchtern sahst du umher, legtest den Schleyer ab
Nahmst das dünne Gewand, weg von der schönsten Brust
Denn du wusstest nicht Laura!
Dass ich hinter der Myrthe war.

O was sah da mein Aug! Laura! was fühlt' ich da
Als das silberne Nass deine Hüften umfloss
Und der wallende Busen
Von den Wellen gehoben ward.

Da ich plätschern den Fuss, rudern die Arme sah,
Stärker klopft' in mir da, mein empfindendes Herz
Als dem Sänger Thorlaugurs
Da er sah der Blakullur Bad

Wo im Lichtstrahl der Fluss, springend den Felsen herab
In dem heiligen Hain, nah bey des Skalden Grab
Diamantene Tropfen
Wie im Silberschein blizen lässt.

Stärker klopfte mein Herz; Ja! denn Blakullur war
Eine Göttinn Valhalls, aber du Laura bist
Eine Göttinn der Erden
Und ein Erdebewohner ich.

Ja es klopfte! Und ich konnte mich länger nicht
Halten hinter dem Busch, und es eilte mein Fuss
Zum bezauberten Flusse
Wo die Göttinn der Erde schwamm.

Doch, sehr bald sah ich nichts: In den Augen empfand
Ich das triefende Nass, das (wie Diana einst
Dem neugiergen Actæon)
Mir die Göttinn entgegen goss.

Als die Blendung verschwand, suchte mein Aug' umsonst!
Traurges Schicksal! Umsonst, sucht' es die Göttliche
Und das Echo nur tönte
Von den Felsen mir: Laura, nach.

Die beiden Petrarcaoden des jungen Cramer gehören zunächst darin eng zusammen, dass in ihnen die gleiche asklepiadeische Strophe in gleicher Weise misshandelt wird. Es enthält nämlich

12 statt 36 asklep. Verse : 22 askl. Verse, 13 Pentam., 1 Zwittervers,
13 „ 30 „ „ 18 „ „ 11 „ 1 „ .

Von den Pentametern sind nach dem strengen Schema der Alten gebaut (mit zwei dreisilbigen Füssen nach der Cäsur): 9 resp. 6 (**12**. 1, 5, 9, 13, 21, 25, 53, 54, 70; **13**. 5, 13, 21, 22, 25, 41), die anderen 4 resp. 5 gehören der freieren, bei unseren deutschen Klassikern häufigen Art an, deren zweite Hälfte mit einem zweisilbigen Fuss beginnt (**12**. 45, 46, 62, 69; **13**. 18, 34, 38, 50, 53). Zwitterverse nenne

ich **12.** 17 und **13.** 9, weil sie aus der ersten Hälfte eines Pentameters und der zweiten Hälfte eines asklepiadeischen Verses bestehen. Verse, die einen Namen fremden Ursprungs enthalten—**12.** 17 'Cynthia,' **13.** 9 'Philomele'—sind in Cramers Jugendgedichten oft unregelmässig.

Die Anregung zu den beiden Petrarcaoden und die darin herrschende Auffassung des Verhältnisses zwischen Petrarca und Laura schöpfte Cramer aus *Les Vies des Hommes et des Femmes illustres d'Italie, Depuis le Rétablissement des Sciences et des beaux Arts; Par une Société de Gens de Lettres.* Tome Premier. A Paris, Chez Vincent, Imprimeur-Libraire, rue Saint Severin. MDCCLXVII. S. 1 bis 68 'La vie de Pétrarque' und S. 118 bis 145 'La vie de Laura, amante de Pétrarque[1].' Die beiden Lebensbeschreibungen verarbeiten das autobiographische Material, das besonders die lateinischen Schriften Petrarcas an die Hand geben, mit vielen Zitaten aus diesen und der Beschreibung einiger Bilder im Hause Petrarcas zu Arqua. Ich stelle Cramers Entlehnungen hier zusammen, wie sie sich bei der Lektüre der beiden Viten ergeben, indem ich gleichzeitig angebe, wo diese letzteren aus Petrarca selbst schöpfen:

Aus 'La vie de Pétrarque':	Cramer:
S. 19: De-là nous est venu ce fameux recueil de chansons dont les charmes se firent sentir par quiconque avoit éprouvé ceux de la tendresse. Tel étoit le sentiment de Pétrarque même, qui écrivit ces sonnets...	Anmerkung zu **12**: *Petrarch* dieser empfindsamste Dichter Italiens, dessen Sonnets, die höchste Stufe von Zärtlichkeit erreicht haben, die Gedichte von dieser, d. i. der zärtlichsten Art erreichen können ist zu bekannt, als dass sein Name, einer Anmerkung bedürfte....
S. 37 bis 39: là, coulent des sources vives...où, sous une ombre épaisse, serpente un ruisseau salutaire, qui...vivifie dans son cours et fait accroître l'herbe... le murmure de la fontaine...Ce lieu enchanté est sous un berceau de feuillage ...On y respire l'odeur suave du parfum le plus délicieux. Ce séjour, image des Champs Elysées,...(Nach Petrarcas poetischem Brief an Barbato da Sulmona	**12.** 1 bis 5: Da wo rieselnd und schön, unter balsamischem Duft Durch die Gräserchen hin, murmelnde Fluthen wälzt (In dem heiligen Haine Der das reizende Vaucluse schmückt) Mein geliebtester Bach... **13.** 51: Zum bezauberten Flusse

[1] Das Werk—2 Bände in 12. Paris 1767—ist eine Übersetzung des französischen Grammatikers A. d'Açarq aus dem Italienischen des Giulio Roberto di Sanseverino. Eine 'Edition considérablement corrigée,' in der u. a. die Vita der Laura fehlt, 2 Bände in 8. erschien Yverdon 1768. In demselben Jahre zeigt die *Deutsche Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* (Siebentes Stück, S. 555) den ersten Band einer deutschen Ausgabe an: 'Italienische Biographie aus dem Französischen übersetzt, nebst einer Vorrede von Herrn Klotz, Erster Band. Frankfurt und Leipzig, bey Dodsley u. Comp. 1768. 422 Seiten 8°.' Der Übersetzer war Johann Georg Meusel. Das *Gelehrte Teutschland*,[5] V. Band, S. 195, nennt unter seinen Werken 'Italienische Biographie; aus dem Französischen. 2 Bände. Leipz. 1769. 1770. 8.'

'Dulcis amice vale. Tua si mihi semper imago,' V. 23 bis 46. Petrarcae Opera latina Venet. 1503, fol. 484[a]. Vgl. *Franz Petrarcas Poetische Briefe*, übers. v. F. Friedersdorff, Halle 1903, S. 173 f., V. 35 bis 66.)

S. 43 f.: la...nouvelle de la mort de sa Laure,...a quel point le consterna cette fatale nouvelle: on peut le voir encore dans le recueil de ses chansons qui ne respirent que sa profonde douleur.

Il nous dit lui-même que, durant dix ans entiers, il la pleura sans cesse;...la beauté du corps n'étoit pas ce qu'il aimoit en elle...'Je la prends, s'écrie-t-il, je la prends à témoin dans le ciel d'où elle m'entend, en joignant à son témoignage celui de ma conscience, que j'aimois moins son corps que la belle ame qui le vivifioit. En voici une preuve évidente. Plus les années s'accumuloient sur sa tête par l'âge qui a coûtume d'être le fléau cruel de la beauté des femmes, plus mon amour devenoit fort et constant. Les outrages du temps sembloient ajoûter au prix des qualités de son ame céleste tout ce qu'ils retranchoient des fleurs de son visage; et comme ce fut son ame qui alluma mes premiers feux pour elle, ce fut son ame encore qui les entretint toujours.' (Nach Petrarcas *Secretum... de contemptu mundi...colloquium tertii diei*, Opera latina, Venet. 1503, fol. 384 K: 'Hanc praesentem in testimonium evoco' u. s. w. Zu 'Hanc praesentem' ist 'Veritatem' zu ergänzen. Durch die falsche Beziehung der Worte auf Laura im Himmel und die unmittelbar vorhergehenden Sätze wurde Cramer verleitet, die Stelle für ein Zitat aus Petrarcas Gedichten in morte di Madonna Laura zu halten.)

S. 45: 'Tout ce que j'avois de plus cher, nous dit-il, un seul naufrage l'a englouti; et la fureur d'une tempête soudaine a brisé mon laurier toujours verd.' (Nach *De rebus familiaribus*, 8. Buch, 3. Brief, vgl. Fracassetti, *Francisci Petrarcae Epistolae de reb. fam. et variae*, 1. Band, Florenz 1859, S. 421.)

S. 53: Pétrarque qui y est aussi, a les yeux fixés sur le charmant visage de Laure; et en le considérant, il commence déja à éprouver peu-à-peu le sort de Daphné. (Beschreibung eines Bildes im Hause Petrarcas in Arqua.)

12. 20, 64, 72 (mit Anlehnung an Klopstocks Ode 'Der Zürchersee,' M.-P., 1, 85):

Und das Thal dir Elysium?
Dieses Thal uns Elysium?
Diese Thäler Elysium.

Anmerkung zu **12**: Ich glaube dass die Empfindungen welche ich ihm in dieser Ode beylege denen sehr nahe kommen die er wirklich gehabt hat. Wenigstens scheint folgende Stelle aus seinen Gedichten, nach der Laura Tod, (!) es zu bestätigen. 'Ich rufe sie' spricht er, 'zur Zeuginn in dem Himmel an wo sie mich hört, und verbind' ihr Zeugniss, mit dem Zeugnisse meines Gewissens, dass ich weniger ihren Leib liebte, als die Seele die ihn bewohnte. Hier ist ein Beweis davon: Je mehr sich die Jahre auf ihrem Haupte häuften, durch das Alter, welches grausam die weibliche Schönheit zu verstören pflegt, je stärker und beständiger ward meine Liebe. Die Beleidigungen der Zeit schienen dem Werthe ihrer himmlischen Seele, alles das zuzulegen, was sie von den Blumen des Gesichts raubten und da 's ihre Seele gewesen war, die mein Feuer angezündet hatte, so war es auch sie die es stets unterhielt.'

12. 60 bis 62:

Denn ich liebe der Laura Herz
Nicht den Schimmer allein...
Ist nicht im Alter dann, wenn die
Schönheit verwelkt

12. 25, 45 bis 47:

Plözlich kam ein Orkan,
...soll ein Orkan...verwehn?
Soll ein grausamer Sturm...tödten?

12. 48, 65 f. (mit Anlehnung an Klopstocks Elegie 'Daphnis und Daphne,' M.-P., 1, 58):

Reisst dich Laura das Schicksal fort?
Reisst die tödtende Zeit, dich mir o
Freundinn weg
Oder muss ich vor dir, nach dem Olymp
hinauf.

Aus 'La vie de Laura, amante de Pétrarque':

S. 119: *la Sorgue*, qui est, comme il l'appelle lui-même, *la reine de toutes les fontaines*. (Nach *Epistola ad posteros*, s. Fracassetti, a. a. O., S. 7.)

S. 124: il n'y avoit...aucune femme qui...montrât sur son teint un mêlange de lys et de roses mieux combiné,

S. 125 f.: un portrait qui représente Laure a la fleur de son âge...sur les joues beaucoup de lys et un peu moins de roses,...

S. 125: que les eaux de la Sorgue devenues sensibles réchauffoient leur froid murmure pour caresser avec ardeur ces pieds, et qu'elles ce précipitoient pour les baiser avec empressement.

S. 130: Rien de plus flateur pour la mémoire de Laure, que ce témoignage que lui rend Pétrarque avec ingénuité. Rien ne seroit plus glorieux pour les *Laures modernes*, que de travailler comme celle de Pétrarque, et de parvenir à former de grands hommes;

S. 131 f.: Pétrarque lui-même en convient dans l'entretien que nous avons cité. 'Petits soins; tendres protestations; pressantes assiduités; séduisantes prieres; pour la fléchir, je mis inutilement tout en usage. Rien ne fut jamais capable, dit-il, de faire oublier un moment à Laure cette aimable pudeur qui sied si bien à une femme. Elle sçut toujours réprimer la bouillante impétuosité de l'âge mobile où nous étions l'un et l'autre, et repousser continuellement beaucoup d'autres motifs qui eussent subjugué une ame moins forte que la sienne. Ce qu'il y a de certain, et j'aime à l'avouer ici, c'est que les sages conseils de cette jeune personne m'instruisoient de ce qu'il convenoit que je fisse pour me comporter en homme sage; ses mœurs qui étoient le modele de la plus parfaite retenue, me reprochoient sans cesse celle que je n'avois point. Dès qu'elle me vit enfin tel qu'un furieux coursier qui a brisé son frein, et qui est près de se perdre dans la profondeur d'un abyme, elle aima mieux m'abandonner que de me suivre. Jamais elle ne changea de résolution, elle fut toujours semblable à elle-même.'

(Nach Petrarcas *Secretum...de contemptu mundi...Colloquium tertii diei.* Opera latina, Venet. 1503, fol. 384 N:

Anmerkung zu **13**: Sorgue, ist der Fluss bey Petrarchs Landgut, der von ihm die *Königinn aller Flüsse* genannt wird,...

12. 45, 47, 57 bis 59:
...diese Rosen...
Diese Lilien...
...den Wangen...
Diese Rosen!...
Diese Lilien...

13. 23 f.:
Ungern rauschte die Sorgue
Von dem schönsten der Füsse weg,

Anmerkung zu **13**: Nichts kann schmeichelhafter für Laura seyn, als das ungezwungne Zeugniss das ihr Petrarch giebt, und nichts würde ruhmwürdiger für die *heutigen Lauren* seyn wenn sie sich so bemühten grosse Männer zu bilden.

Anmerkung zu **13**: Den vortrefflichen Charakter der Laura wird man aus folgender Stelle aus einem von Petrarchs Briefen (!) ein wenig kennen lernen. 'Kleine Verbindlikeiten, zärtliche Betheurungen, drängende Aufmerksamkeiten, verführerische Bitten, alles wurde vergeblich gebraucht sie zu bewegen. Nichts war jemals möglich zu machen dass *Laura* einen Augenblik diese liebenswürdige Schaamhaftigkeit vergässe die einem Frauenzimmer so wohl steht. Sie wuste stets die heisse Ungestümheit des flüchtigen Alters in dem wir waren zu unterdrüken, und beständig viele andre Bewegungsgründe zurück zu stossen, die weniger starke Seelen als die ihrige würden überwunden haben.— Das was gewiss ist, und ich gern gestehe, ist: dass die Rathschläge dieses jungen Frauenzimmers mich lehrten, weise mich zu betragen, und ihre Sitten, die das vollkommneste Muster der Zurückhaltung waren, warfen mir ohne Unterlass vor dass ich sie nicht hätte. Zulezt da sie mich einem wilden Rosse ähnlich sahe dass den Zaum zerrissen hat, und sich in einen tiefen Abgrund stürzen will, verliess sie mich lieber als dass sie mir gefolgt wäre. Niemals änderte sie ihre Entschliessung sondern war sich immer selbst gleich.'

'...cum nullis mota precibus' u. s. w. Cramer verkannte die Bedeutung von 'l'entretien' trotz 'ses trois entretiens avec S. Augustin' (S. 42) und dem Hinweis auf 'l'entretien du troisieme jour' (S. 128) und verlegte die Stelle in einen 'von Petrarchs Briefen.')

S. 132 ff.: Un jour d'été, a l'heure où le soleil darde avec la plus de violence sur le globe de la terre ses rayons enflammés, assise aux bords d'une onde claire, elle en contemploit dans le silence et dans la tranquillité la tremblante surface qui traçoit l'image du plus beau crystal; s'y voyant seule, elle crut pouvoir céder a l'invitation que sembloit lui faire le murmure frais et délicieux du liquide fugitif et transparent. A peine fut-elle deshabillée et descendue sans aucun voile artificiel dans le sein de l'humide élément qui couloit devant elle, que Pétrarque se montra inopinément sur l'une des deux rives. Quel plaisir d'un côté! Quelle peine de l'autre! Il n'y a qu'une femme pénétrée des mêmes sentiments que Laure, qui puisse juger de l'extrême surprise et du chaste embarras où se trouva celle-ci. Elle rougit également de dépit et de honte, et ne sçachant comment remédier à l'inconvénient qu'elle n'avoit pas même soupçonné, elle employa ses deux mains à lever des lames d'eau qu'elle lança avec rapidité dans les yeux de son amant pour les fermer au moins jusqu'à ce qu'elle se fût dérobée à leur indiscrétion; le strategême eut tout son effect. Cette aventure galante fut consignée dans un tableau....Ce tableau montre non seulement Laure plongée dans la fontaine jusqu'à la ceinture, et Pétrarque les yeux couverts de deux lames d'eau, mais encore dans le lointain une expression parfaite d'Actéon métamorphosé en cerf,...

(Nach Petrarcas Kanzone 'Nel dolce tempo della prima etade,' Stanze 8, V. 8 ff.)

S. 139: Ainsi finit ses jours, Laure, pour qui le flambeau de l'hymen ne s'alluma jamais; elle mena la vie la plus irréprochable.

Anmerkung zu 12. 23 f.: ...'An einem Sommertage, in der Stunde wo die Sonne mit der grössten Heftigkeit, ihre entflammten Strahlen auf die Erde schiesst, sass *Laura* am Rande eines klaren Wassers. Sie betrachtete in der Stille, und in der Ruhe die zitternde Oberfläche des Wassers, die dem schönsten Crystalle ähnlich sah, und da sie allein war, glaubte sie die Einladung annehmen zu können, die ihr das frische und reizende Murmeln, des schnellen und durchsichtigen Baches zu thun schien. Kaum war sie ausgekleidet und in das feuchte Element ohne einigen künstlichen Schleyer gestiegen, so erschien Petrarch unvermuthet an einem der beyden Ufer. Welche Freude auf der einen, welche Verwirrung auf der andern Seite! Niemand als ein Frauenzimmer, von eben den Empfindungen als Laura durchdrungen, kan von dem äussersten Erstaunen und der verschämten Verwirrung urtheilen wo sie sich befand. Sie erröthete gleich viel aus Schaam als aus Verwirrung und Verdruss, und da sie nicht wusste wie sie dem Unfalle abhelfen sollte, den sie nicht einmal hatte vermuthen können, so schöpfte sie mit beyden Händen Strahlen von Wasser die sie mit Schnelligkeit ihrem Liebhaber in die Augen sprüzte, um sie wenigstens so lange zuzuschliessen, bis sie sich der Neubegierde derselben entzogen hätte. Diese List, hatte die erwünschte Würkung' etc.

13. 53 ff.:

In den Augen empfand
Ich das triefende Nass, das (wie Diana einst
Dem neugiergen Actæon)
Mir die Göttinn entgegen goss.

Anmerkung zu 13: Sie starb auch, ohne dass Hymens Fackel war für sie angezündet worden, ohne jemals die sinnlichen Süssigkeiten der Liebe empfunden zu haben...

Vorsichtig und mit einer gewissen Methode hat der junge Cramer von dem, was ihm jene 95 Druckseiten im Duodezformat aus der

Gedankenwelt Petrarcas übermittelten, nur das benutzt, was als Zitat aus Petrarca oder auch als Gegenstand bildlicher Darstellung sich ihm als authentisch empfahl. Wie wenig er Petrarca kannte, beweist die Tatsache, dass er für seine Schilderung von Vaucluse Farben borgt bei einer französischen Prosawiedergabe lateinischer Hexameter, in denen Petrarca die Waldeinsamkeit von Selvapiana (zwischen Parma und Modena) besingt; dasselbe beweisen ferner die Anmerkungen, in denen er Stellen aus dem dritten Gespräch mit dem heiligen Augustin in die 'Gedichte nach der Laura Tod' oder die 'Briefe' Petrarcas verlegt. Darum glaub ich auch nicht, dass er die *Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque* des Abbé de Sade kannte, denn diese enthalten im zweiten Bande, Amsterdam 1764, S. 101 bis 138, eine so ausführliche Inhaltsangabe oder vielmehr gekürzte Übersetzung der Gespräche mit Augustin, dass er jene Zitate aus dem dritten Gespräch als solche wiedererkannt haben müsste. (Sieh besonders *Mémoires* II, 117.)

Zum Schluss noch ein Wort über die Entlehnungen der beiden Petrarcaoden aus der Skaldendichtung.

Zu **12.** 69 bemerkt Cramer: '*Allfadur*, oder *Allvater*, war das höchste Wesen bey den alten Deutschen, die andern Gottheiten, als: Thoor, Herta, Freya, u. a. waren eigentlich nur Untergottheiten. Die Begriffe die sie sich davon machten, waren vielleicht die reinsten die sich jemals Heiden von Gott gemacht hatten...' Zu dieser Anmerkung vgl. Gerstenbergs 'Erläuterung der Eddensprache' im *Gedicht eines Skalden* (hrsg. v. A. v. Weilen, *DLD. d.* 18. *u.* 19. *Jh.*, 30, S. 357), zu den Versen **12.** 69 f. Klopstocks *Hermanns Schlacht* am Anfang der 8. und am Ende der 12. Scene (*Werke*, hrsg. v. R. Hamel, IV, S. 106 u. 139).

Zu **13.** 40 bemerkt Cramer: 'Der Liebhaber des Fräulein P. hat in seinem Gedichte *die Skalden*, worinnen er Sandholm besingt, bey Gelegenheit der sich badenden nordischen Göttin *Blakullur*, über diese feine und reizende Materie, die schönste Stelle die jemals aus der Feder eines Dichters geflossen ist. Es ist freylich wahr, *Gerstenberg* lebt 500 Jahre später als *Petrarch*, aber was geht den Dichter die Chronologie an? Wenigstens glaube ich doch keinen grössern Fehler begangen zu haben, als *Virgil* da er die Dido mit dem Aeneas sprechen lässt, oder *Milton* bey dem der Teufel zur Zeit der Schöpfung ein Gleichniss von Mosis Zeit borgt. Und am Ende darf man sich nur den Verfasser dieser Ode als einen *Zweyten Petrarch* und seine * * * als eine *Zweyte Laura* vorstellen und das übrige wie sichs gehört hinzu-

denken, so wird es nicht einmal ein Fehler seyn.' Wenn Cramer, wie Gervinus sagt, mit seinem übermässigen Selbstgefühl und Dünkel die Mitglieder des Hains abstiess, so sehen wir hier, dass er auch vor seiner Göttinger Zeit sich nicht durch übermässige Bescheidenheit auszeichnete. 'Der Liebhaber des Fräulein P.' ist Gerstenberg mit Bezug auf das zwölfte Stück des *Hypochondristen*[1]. Sandholm, das Landgut seines Vaters bei Kopenhagen, war Carl Friedrich Cramers Vaucluse. Hier fand er Hain und Quelle der Petrarcastätten. Hier wandelte er als ein '*Zweyter Petrarch.*' Sandholm war aber auch der Schauplatz von Gerstenbergs *Gedicht eines Skalden.* Die Brücke von Laura im Bade (*Les Vies,* I, 132 f.) zu Blakullur im Bade (*Gedicht eines Skalden,* a. a. O., S. 361) war schon durch die einleitenden Sätze der beiden Stellen geschlagen:

dans le silence et dans la tranquillité	Still war die Luft.....
la tremblante surface qui traçoit l'image	Der See vom Hauch der Luft bewegt,
du plus beau crystal ;	Crystallne Wellen von sich jägt.

Und nun zieht sich die Erinnerung an Gerstenbergs Verse durch die ganze Ode Cramers. Vgl. besonders:

Im Schatten dieses Eichenhayns,...	13. 7
Still war die Luft, in Majestät Lag die Natur	10 bis 13
Ein breiter Quell, schwillt auf zum breitern Fluss, Springt donnernd über jähe Spitzen, Und diamantne Tropfen blitzen, Im Lichtstrahl und im Silberschein	41 bis 44
.....der weissen Glieder .....Hüften	25 34
Die runden Arme rudern durch die Fluth ; Die kleinen Füsse rudern..... Der volle Busen wallt auf zarten Wogen.	 37 35 f.

In der nächsten Nummer dieser Zeitschrift hoffe ich meine Mitteilungen über Cramers Jugendgedichte abzuschliessen.

JULIUS FREUND.

SHEFFIELD.

[1] *Der Hypochondrist*, eine hollsteinische Wochenschrift, Schleswig 1762. Das zwölfte Stück, 'Aus dem Liebesarchiv meines Neffen,' enthält mehrere Liebesbriefe 'An das Fräulein P.' (S. 191 ff.)

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Cambridge Play 'Lælia.'

In my edition of this play (1910) I argued that Fuller's statement, to the effect that *Lælia* was performed before Lord Essex at Queens' College after he had become Chancellor[1], was not to be depended on, and I gave grounds for thinking that the performance of the play before Lord Essex at Queens' took place really on 1st March, 1595. To this opinion I still adhere, but I find that in the course of my argument I over-stated my case. I said 'I believe there is no other evidence of any visit paid by Essex to the University as Chancellor.' This appears to be wrong, as Harleian MS. 7038 fol. 68 et seq. (in Baker's hand, with this note by him, 'Ex MS° Tennisoniano [aucto ex collect. MS. Guil. Dillingham, S. T. P.]') has the following note[2].

An. 1598.

Hoc anno moriente Gul: Cecilio Aug. 4. An. 1598 ætatis 77 succedit Robertus D. Comes Essex: Comes Essex. Cancellar. invisebat Acad: publicis Comitiis. Respond. D^re^ Branthwaite Forma precum publicarum est necessario præscribenda. Patres Gentilesq*ue* Scriptores in concionibus licet et expedit allegare. Respond. M^ro^ Shaxton Col. Trin. Idem effectus principalis Scriptorum veterum et novorum. Specialis Dei misericordia in Christo est fidei justificantis objectum. Bac. A. 175/ MA 114/ Bac. Juris 3/ Mus 1/ Lib. Comp.

Now Essex as Chancellor could not have been present at the July Commencement either in 1598 (when he was not yet Chancellor) nor in 1599 (when he was in Ireland). If he was present at a Commencement at all, it must have been at the Bachelors' Commencement held in February or March 1599—but Cooper in his *Annals of Cambridge* makes no mention of such a visit, and we know nothing of any acting of plays before Essex at this time. It is true that plays were given at Trinity, and at great expense (54*s.* being spent on a supper to the

[1] There is no such statement, as Mr E. Abbott kindly tells me, in Jesus College MS. R. 3. 42, which is Fuller's earlier form of his History of the University.

[2] Partly quoted in Heywood and Wright's *University Transactions* under the same year.

actors), and if Essex was in Cambridge, he was no doubt present. But the accounts of Queens' College show no signs of any performance of plays there. Moreover the whole tenor of the note quoted above points clearly to the 'publica comitia' being the 'Magna Comitia' held in July, and not the 'Comitia Bacchalaureorum' held in February or March.

I therefore maintain (i) that if Essex visited Cambridge in 1598–9 it was at the time of the Bachelors' Commencement (which is hardly consistent with the only record of the visit we have) and (ii) that this was not the occasion when he saw *Lælia* at Queens' College—which was rather, as I argued before, on March 1st, 1595.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Shakespeare, 'All's Well,' iv, v, 14—22.

Laf. 'Twas a good Lady, 'twas a good Lady. Wee may picke a thousand sallets ere wee light on such another hearbe.
Clo. Indeed sir she was the sweete Margerom of the sallet, or rather the hearbe of grace.
Laf. They are not hearbes you knaue, they are nose-hearbes.
Clowne. I am no great *Nabuchadnezar* sir, I haue not much skill in grace.
First Folio.

Rowe most needlessly altered 'grace' to 'grass' in line 22. In the Shakespearean pronunciation 'grace' and 'grass' were much more alike than they are at the present day. It is a pity that all subsequent editions have adopted Rowe's alteration and thereby spoilt the Clown's little play on words.

A. Joanna Partridge.

Hockham.

The Authorship of 'Absence, hear thou my protestation.'

This poem has been ascribed to Donne in recent years almost entirely upon internal evidence. It was not printed in any of the older editions of Donne's poems (1633, 1635, 1650, 1654, 1669 or 1719) and although included in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody* (1602, 1608, 1621) it was not there ascribed to Donne. It was first printed as Donne's in *The Grove*, a collection of miscellaneous poems issued by W. Mears in 1721. A note prefixed to the poem says, 'This Poem was found in an old Manuscript of Sir John Cotton's of Stratton in Huntington-shire.'

Of the particular manuscript I know nothing, but we know that many poems are ascribed to Dr Donne in late seventeenth century manuscripts which are none of his. The poem does, however, occur in some fairly good manuscript collections of Donne's poems, but, as said above, it was not included in the editions, it was not, although published, ascribed to Donne during his life-time, and it is not found in either of what I hope to show are the two most authoritative groups or families of manuscripts of Donne's poems.

It is on internal evidence that Mr Bullen and Professor Saintsbury rely. 'There can not be the least doubt,' the former says in his introduction to a reprint of Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody* (1890), 'that the Ode is by John Donne. What other poet would have written in this strain?

> By absence this good means I gain
> That I can catch her,
> Where none can watch her,
> In some close corner of my brain.
> There I embrace and kiss her
> And so I both enjoy, and miss her.'

Professor Saintsbury is equally emphatic, 'All the best authorities agree (and for my part I would almost go to the stake upon it) that the piece is Donne's' (*Donne's Poems*, Muses' Library, 1896). Mr Bullen and Professor Saintsbury are high authorities on seventeenth century song, none higher; but I have never felt sure that in this case they are right. The metaphysical, subtle strain of thought in the poem certainly suggests Donne, but the passionate, confident mood of feeling expressed has in it more of Sidney, of lines like 'I, I, O, I may say that she is mine.' When Donne is gay, he is more cynical; when he writes of absence, it is in a more passionate and troubled vein. There seems to me a great difference between any of Donne's 'Valedictions,' as

> Let me pour forth
> My tears before thy face, while I stay here,

or

> So, so, break off this last lamenting kiss,

or even the more consolatory

> As virtuous men pass mildly away,

and such an airy strain as

> By Absence this good means I gain.

But to a discussion of this kind there could be no end. What I wish to do is to present some facts which seem to confirm the view that the

poem is not by Donne, and to point to the actual author. 'Absence, hear thou my protestation' is one of the poems contained in a small manuscript volume of poems preserved, with other manuscripts of William Drummond of Hawthornden, in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries at Edinburgh. This manuscript has a much better authenticated history than is usual in the case of these manuscript collections of seventeenth century poems. It is in Drummond's own handwriting and is stated by him to consist of 'poems belonging to Jhon Don. Transcribed by William Drummond.' It is a small collection of miscellaneous poems including a few by Donne himself. Most of them are clearly initialled; Donne's own with an interwoven JD. Other initials are E. P. (apparently Earl of Pembroke), J. R. (John Roe), B. R. (Benjamin Rudyard). This particular poem is initialled J. H. Mr Chambers (*Donne's Poems*, Muses' Library, II, 275) in mentioning this added 'perhaps the initials of Sir John Harrington,' and I, writing from memory, made this ascription more absolutely in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. There is, however, no likelihood that Harrington could or would have written the song. Moreover 'Absence, hear thou my protestation' is not the only song initialled J. H. in the manuscript. There is another beginning, 'Love is a foolish melancholy.' Now *this* song appears also in a manuscript preserved in the Chetham Library at Manchester, which was published by Dr Grosart, in 1873, as the Farmer-Chetham Manuscript (*Chetham Society Publications*, Vols. LXXXIX, XC). In this manuscript it appears alongside some other poems by John Hoskins, and is signed 'Mr Hoskins.' If this ascription be correct (and the ascriptions of this manuscript seem generally accurate), then clearly the J. H. of the Hawthornden MS. is John Hoskins, and we have Donne's own authority, reported by Drummond, for ascribing 'Absence, hear thou my protestation' to Hoskins.

Not much of Hoskins' poetry has been preserved, but Wood says 'he was the most ingenious and admired poet of his day,' and the friend of, among others, Donne, Rudyard and Jonson. He left a volume of poems 'bigger than those of Dr Donne,' which was lent by his son 'to a certain person' in 1653 and never recovered. Of his extant poems some, e.g. 'Love is a foolish melancholy,' 'Dreams' in the Chetham manuscript, and the dialogue with Wotton in Hannah's *Courtly Poets*, suggest that he might well, in a happy moment, have composed 'Absence.' If he did (and the evidence to my mind seems stronger than for many ascriptions of seventeenth century poems), it is only

right that he should come by his own. The happy chance which has restored to us the works of Traherne may yet give us Hoskins' lost volume.

H. J. C. Grierson.

Aberdeen.

'Hostages to Fortune.'

'He that hath Wife and Children, hath given Hostages to Fortune,' Bacon, *Of Marriage and Single Life*. I do not know if it has been remarked before that the origin of this famous sentence seems to be Lucan, *Pharsalia*, vii, 661—2, where Pompey is made to say

si plura iuuant mea uolnera, coniunx
est mihi, sunt nati; dedimus tot pignora fatis.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

'Loves extreamest Line.'

In Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*, i, 404, Arcite, restored to liberty, but banished from Athens, envies Palamon, still a prisoner, the privilege of seeing Emily daily from the window of his dungeon:

Thou daily seest that Sun of Beauty shine,
And *lov'st at least in Loves extreamest Line.*

Professor Saintsbury (*The Works of John Dryden*, Scott and Saintsbury, Vol. xi, p. 267) explains the last phrase as 'outermost region'; Professor Noyes (*The Poetical Works of John Dryden*, Cambridge Edition) as 'A metaphor from the two poles of the earth, where day and night are each six months long.' But it is taken from Terence, *Eunuchus*, 640, where Phaedria says:

si non tangendi copiast,
eho ne uidendi quidem erit? si illud non licet,
saltem hoc licebit. *certe extrema linea*
amare haud nil est.

Lewis and Short well explain the meaning as 'to love at a distance, i.e. to see the beloved object only at a distance, not be able to speak to her.'

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

A Critique by Horace Walpole.

In one of his letters to Mason (22 March 1796)[1], Walpole is unusually savage against a certain 'trumpery prosaic poetaster' named Knight, whom he dubs 'the Knight of the Brazen Milk-Pot,' who had attempted 'to re-establish the superannuated atheism of Lucretius,' by means of an 'insolent and self-conceited poem.' The person referred to is Richard Payne Knight, the well-known numismatist and collector. Mitford's note on this passage begins:

> Mr Knight. This 'new, insolent, and self-conceited poem,' is *The Landscape*, a Didactic Poem, in three Books, addressed to Uvedale Price, Esq., by R. P. Knight, 4to.' Walpole's anger was excited by the disparagement shown in this new School of Landscape Gardening, advocated by Mr Knight and Mr Price, of his friend, Mr Brown, of whose abilities he thought, and justly, very highly, etc.

Cunningham merely follows Mitford. Mrs Toynbee is less confident; her brief note is:

> Probably *The Landscape, a Didactic Poem*, of which a second edition appeared in 1795.

All three editors, however, are in error. It is true that Walpole, in his third paragraph, refers to *The Landscape*, in which Knight 'has given an ugly clumsy Etruscan brass milkpot as a model of the line of beauty.' But the poem which here chiefly aroused the aged Walpole's wrath was *The Progress of Civil Society. A Didactic Poem in Six Books.* London. Printed by W. Bulmer and Co. for G. Nicol. 1796. 4to. It is a poem of some three thousand two hundred lines, in heroic couplets, based on the fifth book of Lucretius beginning with line 923; the author also acknowledges indebtedness to Pope, whose *Essay on Man* obviously formed a model. It is divided into six books, with the following titles: I. Of Hunting. II. Of Pasturage. III. Of Agriculture. IV. Of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce. V. Of Climate and Soil. VI. Of Government and Conquest. The whole performance was harmless and insipid, and might have been speedily forgotten had it not been for 'the liberties he has taken with our late great and respectable friend'—not Mr Brown, as Mitford supposed, but Thomas Gray.

[1] *Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Toynbee, No. 2996, xv, 397 ff.

The passage dealing with Gray is found in Book III, ll. 395—426, and begins thus:

> See, of Reviews and Baviads in despite,
> Each month new swarms of Baviuses write;
> While Lloyd's light laugh, and Johnson's growl could lay,
> In dumb repose, the genius of a Gray!
> Too timid bard! by feelings nice oppress'd,
> He shrunk abash'd from envy's paltry jest;
> And, with fastidious modesty, resign'd
> To learned trifles all his mighty mind.

By 'Lloyd's light laugh,' Knight of course meant the *Odes to Obscurity and Oblivion* which Robert Lloyd and George Colman perpetrated at a meeting of the Nonsense Club (they were published in 1760), and which certainly did not disturb Gray much. But to what extent Johnson's growl helped to lay Gray's genius 'in dumb repose,' is not by any means so clear. Everybody knows what opinion each had of the other; but what evidence is there that Gray was aware of Johnson's opinion and was influenced by it?

One would also like to know who was the near relation and intimate friend of Walpole who had such admiration for Knight; but this is not an important question and its solution must wait for the present.

In his second paragraph Walpole speaks of Knight's 'presuming to pronounce [Lucretius] the best of the Roman poets, just as he allots the same rank to Sheridan over Gray and our first Bards.' The passage to which he refers occurs in a note on page 120:

> It is a melancholy reflection, that though Great Britain has been more fertile in poetical genius, during the present age, than at any preceding period of her history, no important work has been produced. Johnson, Goldsmith, Churchill, Gray, and Chatterton, were all, in a great measure, lost to the Muses for want of proper encouragement; and a still greater genius, who is now living, has sacrificed poetry to politics; in which, whatever parties prevail, or whatever abilities he may display, he will have the mortification to find, that the cringing servility of a drudge in office is a more effective recommendation to places of power and emolument, than all the splendours of the sublimest eloquence.

This passage, it may be remarked, would indicate that although Knight may not have been a poet, he is entitled to be counted among the prophets. Incidentally his confusion of poetry and drama may be noted; Sheridan wrote very little verse.

Contemporary opinion of Knight, which may or may not have influenced Walpole, is indicated by the following quotation from *Literary Memoirs of Living Authors of Great Britain*, London, 1798, i, 345:

The proficiency of this gentleman in classical knowledge and polite literature are such, as to entitle him to a very respectable estimation in the republic of letters; but we are sorry to add that he is the author of a book, which has been justly called one of the most unbecoming and indecent treatises which ever disgraced the pen of a man who would be thought a scholar and a philosopher. We refer to his first publication, viz. a Disquisition, in quarto, on the Worship of Priapus, with plates, printed in 1786, and never published, but liberally distributed, etc.

Knight defends himself against the charge of immorality in the preface to *The Progress of Civil Society*. See also Warwick Wroth's remarks in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. Knight.

Clark S. Northup.

London.

DISCUSSIONS.

Spenser's Sonnets 'As Published.'

Mr J. C. Smith, in his complimentary but unfortunately incomplete review of my paper on *Spenser and Lady Carey*, hesitates to accept either its position (in entirety) or the traditional view of the *Amoretti*, and finally proposes a new, definite theory of their composition[1]. He says (p. 280): 'It seems to me possible that Spenser *did* indite a series of complimentary sonnets to Lady Carey; that some misunderstanding arose between them just before his departure for Ireland, and that they afterwards had, or feigned, a quarrel; or, more simply, that absence soon wore out his conventional devotion; that, in either case, he presently fell genuinely in love, and used up parts of this complimentary series in addresses to her whom Prior would have called his "real flame."'

This conclusion accedes to my main contention, restoring the series (in first intention, at least) to Spenser's courtly mistress, Lady Carey[2]. Mr Smith, however, suggests that it was reshaped to apply to Elizabeth Boyle, and he notes in this connexion (p. 280, *n.* 2) that: 'Mr Long himself glances, in one sentence, at the plausibility of just such a *contaminatio*, but in the opposite sense; i.e., he thinks that sonnets originally written to Spenser's wife may have been incorporated in the complimentary set.' This is news to me, and unwelcome. I did state (p. 264) that: 'In this event [Spenser's supposed marriage in 1594] the utmost that can be claimed for Elizabeth Boyle is the appending or interspersing of later sonnets[3].' This is not opposite to, but identical with, what Mr Smith has chosen to claim.

The view is beset with difficulties. It implies that Spenser, in finishing the work prepared for his 'real flame,' was an astonishingly

[1] See *The Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. III, pp. 256—67 (April 1908) and Vol. V, pp. 273—81 (July 1910).

[2] Mr Smith's attitude toward the question whether Charillis is Lady Carey vacillates. Where he rejects it (p. 276) before accepting it (pp. 279, 280), he passes over the entire argument (Vol. III, p. 259, *n.* and pp. 264—5), merely rejecting two suggestions as to why Spenser and the records disagree. He offers a third (p. 280), the possibility of which I admit. But, in any case, Spenser's ignorance of the relative ages of two married sisters—seventh and tenth among eleven children—proves no 'want of intimacy' with the family. And it is always possible that Spenser may have been right, and the scanty record a case of miscopying.

[3] More explicitly yet I stated (p. 262): 'In this case [that Spenser, when paying court to Lady Carey, was already married] the *Amoretti* could not have been addressed to the lady who became his wife.'

negligent craftsman; for he leaves the *Amoretti*, as Mr Smith admits[1], with a glaringly inappropriate ending. Spenser's finish is nowhere more exquisite than in the *Epithalamion*. If the two are intended as companion pieces—regardless of the unrelated fragments printed between, regardless too of the fact that the *Epithalamion* has a separate title-page—Spenser's omission of all trace of connexion is anomalous and incongruous with his usual delicate transitions[2]. Again, the marriage date (June 11th) is precise: it renders disproportionate the stretch of twenty-one sonnets (in a sequence of eighty-eight) after the second Easter and ending some time before the marriage. This is incontestable evidence that Spenser did not make over the structure to harmonize with his marriage song. Indeed, Mr Smith admits (p. 280) that: 'The parting which Spenser bewails [at the end of the sequence] would thus belong to the original series.' It does, in fact, harmonize with the opening sonnet of the series, and is an ending paralleling those of the sequences by Thomas Watson and Sidney. At most, then, Spenser interspersed a number of sonnets and changed, tacitly, the last—though not the first—name of the lady.

If Spenser was thus a slovenly poet in praising his 'real flame,' he was also for once curiously tactless. The court circle, familiar with Spenser's service of Lady Carey, must have seen in the series one more tribute to her whom Nash says 'in all his writings he [Spenser] prizeth.' Intimation that another Elizabeth now was meant must have cost Spenser the enmity of one of the Queen's intimates. On the other hand, if Spenser gave no intimation—and we know of none—these praises of his 'real flame' were an unworthy equivocation, praises inevitably misunderstood by all but a narrow circle—a circle, too, where poetry cannot have been highly valued (for the name of Elizabeth Boyle never appears conjoined with that of Spenser). Surely, the game was not worth the candle.

Nor can I admit that Mr Smith has disposed of the envoi to the *Epithalamion*. 'It is,' he says (p. 275), 'in vain to try to rehabilitate the traditional view while the epilogue to the *Epithalamion* blocks the way.' He therefore proposes a diverse reading of the line:

> Song! made in lieu of many ornaments.

The ornaments, I contend, are poetic tributes in the same sense as in the sixth line:

> Be unto her a goodly ornament.

This explains the envoi as an apology for the absence of other poems in honour of Spenser's 'owne love[3].' Mr Smith, to differentiate the lines, considers the ornaments to be 'the bridegroom's presents,' which he supposes may have arrived late because the wedding had been set

[1] See *The Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. v, pp. 279 f.

[2] No such separation is found in *Astrophel* or in the *Fowre Hymnes*.

[3] Spenser further indicates this by invoking the Muses (st. 1) who have often helped him 'others to adorne' now to

> Helpe me mine owne loues prayses to resound.

He cites the example of Orpheus in apology for such unconventionality.

forward. This involves no little historical fiction. Moreover, it is the poem and not the wedding which Spenser accuses of 'cutting off' the ornaments; and one can readily understand how such a noble theme, when once conceived, 'would not stay' its 'dew time to expect,' but would demand immediate expression. Mr Smith admits that his explanation is prosaic; is it, then, Spenserian? A case parallel to this is found in the *Shepheardes Calendar*, toward the close of the December eclogue, in 'the fragrant flowres' (l. 109):

> Ah! who has wrought my Rosalind this spight,
> To spill the flowres that should hir girlond dight?
> (ll. 113—4.)

E. K. glosses this: '*The fragrant flowres*, sundry studies and laudable partes of learning, wherein our Poet is seene, be they witnesse which are privie to this study.' If then the ornaments must naturally be regarded as poetic tributes, one cannot link the poem to the *Amoretti* as they stand: for the sequence contains too many poems, rather than too few, to fit the circumstances.

Mr Smith's argument against my (supposed) position is directed chiefly (p. 275) against a courtship of Lady Carey and Elizabeth Boyle at the same time. No one, I think, has entertained the idea. Not that it is in itself unreasonable, as Mr Smith urges: for Spenser's patron, Raleigh, carried on such a dual courtship of the Queen and Elizabeth Throckmorton; and, as to publication of the praises of two women in one volume, it may be noted that Spenser dedicated *Astrophel* to Sidney's widow, while in that poem he told of Sidney's exclusive and whole-souled devotion to another woman, Stella. But the idea is a chimera. Mr Smith says of me (p. 275): 'He evidently feels the difficulty of allowing the real and the imaginary wooing to synchronize, and he seeks to avoid it by disputing the received date of the former.' But such synchronism never occurred to me: my suggestion of an early date for Spenser's marriage was due to quite another reason (see the note at the end of this paper). Spenser could hardly have courted Elizabeth Boyle during his stay in London; and it is to that time—to 1589–91—that I referred the composition of the *Amoretti*[1]. Although I stated (p. 264) it to be 'almost incredible' that they were not written then, Mr Smith infers (p. 275) that I date them 'as published' to 1592–3–4, on four grounds which I do 'not indeed urge' but 'would probably admit.' All these Mr Smith makes no attempt to controvert when he suggests (p. 280) the date 1589–91; nor need he, for they all depend on *Am.* LXXX, which he therefore must regard as one of the later sonnets addressed to Spenser's 'real flame.' The assumption is made because this sonnet alludes to the completion of six books of the *Faerie Queene*. It is none the less unnecessary. (1) The version alluded to may have been a first draft, and

[1] In *Am.* LIV the imagery drawn from the theatre connotes the environment of London; and it may not be merely fanciful to read in *Am.* XXIV an allusion to Lyly's *Woman in the Moon*.

probably was, since the sonnet was written fully two years before their publication. (2) The allusion in *F. Q.*, v, xi (necessarily later than July 1593) is likely to have been, as Mr Smith admits, an afterthought. (3) The last lines of Book III appear to have been a makeshift to round off the volume rather than the original ending of the Amoret-Scudamour story. No other book has so definite an ending—it is Spenser's custom throughout to suggest an immediate continuation—except Book VI. There a similar artifice appears. (4) The completion of Books IV—VI in 1591–2 does not imply anomalous speed. In part they may have been planned and written before Spenser went to London in 1589. In part they are regarded as early material reworked. Mr Smith, in his edition of the *Faerie Queene* (Vol. I, p. xi), allows but intermittent work on the first instalment until 1588–9, and therefore reduces the earlier—and probably more difficult—work to a period not very dissimilar in length.

Not only is *Am.* LXXX no obstacle to dating the sequence within Spenser's stay in London: it ceases to be even a drawback in view of the fact that the episode concluding Book VI—the marriage of Essex with Sidney's widow—was of greatest interest at that time. This was therefore probably composed then, at first perhaps as a separate pastoral[1]. Its incidental praise of the lady of the *Amoretti* (*F. Q.*, VI x) further confirms the evidence that they were then in the making. Should Mr Smith insist, notwithstanding, that *Am.* LXXX must be regarded as a later insertion, he must then reckon with it as a positive argument that Spenser had not altered his first intention; for it terms Spenser's lady 'the handmayd of the Faery Queene'—an expression very appropriate in the case of Lady Carey[2], very inapt in the case of Elizabeth Boyle.

If, despite these considerations, we are to believe that Spenser reshaped the *Amoretti* to suit the bride of the *Epithalamion*, some evidence of such reshaping should be perceptible. Mr Smith accordingly advances (pp. 277—8) certain 'positive evidence that would lead us to identify the mistress of the *Amoretti* with the bride of the *Epithalamion*.' The evidence consists of two 'general correspondences,' four 'striking' correspondences, and the 'tone' of certain sonnets.

Of the first 'general' correspondence (*Am.* LXXX with *Epi.* 14), it may be said that to sing one's 'loves prayses' is no very close parallel, and might be used for a diversity of loves. As to the second, the refrain of the *Epithalamion*, though approximated in *Am.* XIX, l. 7 (not 14), is equally foreshadowed long before in *Sh. Cal.*, August, ll. 151—2, 159—60, 166, and in *The Teares of the Muses*, ll. 21—2.

Still less convincing are the four 'striking' correspondences. The

[1] Spenser's close relations with Essex in 1591 are evident from his fulsome praises of Essex's secretary Alabaster in *Colin Clout*, ll. 400—15.

[2] The high favour of Lady Carey is evidenced (in Nichols' *Progresses*) by Queen Elizabeth's New Year gift to her in 1588–9 of 34 oz. of gilt plate. This exceeded in value her gift to any other lady of her rank. Of twenty baronesses only two received more, and of fourteen countesses only three. Among fifty-eight in all, Lady Carey in this count ranked seventh—a place markedly above her station.

first (*Am.* XIII with *Epi.* IX) is in fact a striking contrast. In the sonnet, the lady's bearing is 'proud'; in the song, 'So farre from being proud.' Though in both the eyes are fixed on the ground, in the sonnet, 'Her faire face she reares up to the skie,' and 'That same lofty countenance seemes to scorne'; whereas in the song, 'Her modest eyes' are 'abashed to behold So many gazers,' and she 'Ne dare lift up her countenance too bold.' The first explicitly constitutes a symbolic portrayal of 'goodly temperature,' of 'Myld humblesse, mixt with awfull majesty' (ll. 4—5; see also *Am.* XXI), precisely paralleling the 'temperance' of Charillis in *Colin Clout* (l. 551), as Mr Smith might have observed I had noted (p. 265). In the song, however, there is no admixture of pride[1]. Mr R. E. Neil Dodge (*Spenser's Poetical Works*, pp. 716—7) rightly singles out this pride as a characteristic of the lady of the Amoretti[2]. It is but fair to suggest that the disappearance of this pride in the *Epithalamion*, if taken to indicate the gradual and finally complete triumph of the lover, creates an artistic link between the poems, the trait being conventional and perhaps naught but a literary artifice. Yet, as Mr Dodge notes, in the sonnets the lady's 'friends' accuse her of something like a *mésalliance* (see *Am.* LXVI). Certainly nothing parallels this in the marriage song.

The second 'striking' correspondence (*Am.* XV with *Epi.* X)—dwelling on the charms of the person—consists of the opening lines addressed respectively to 'Ye tradefull Merchants' and 'ye merchants daughters' (though the lady is in no wise besmirched with mercantile relations), and the concluding lines descriptive of the beloved's spiritual excellence as seen by 'few' or 'no' eyes. But 'Her mind adornd with vertues [accomplishments] manifold' suggests intellectual attainments suitable to the learned Lady Carey rather than the vivacity implied in 'The inward beauty of her lively spright.' The physical resemblance amounts to eyes like 'saphyres,' and red lips (one's like rubies, the other's like cherries). In the sonnets are figured an ivory forehead, silver hands, and golden locks; in the song, a neck like marble, cheeks like red apples, paps like lilies, and a breast like a 'bowle of cream uncrudded.' The diversity of perspective is obviously suited to the more intimate occasion. From all this there issues no conclusive point of resemblance[3].

The third 'striking' correspondence (*Am.* LXXXIII with *Epi.* XI) falls with least difficulty under the category of virtues: in them the resemblance is confined to two, modesty and chastity, qualities which a lover might well attribute to divers lady loves. In each case the lady appears too holy to be solicited by things evil. But this is characteristic of Spenser's general attitude toward love as heaven-born

[1] See *Epi.*, ll. 159—64, 210—4, 222, 234—5. In l. 306 is shown not pride, but modest dignity.

[2] See (enlarging Dodge's list) *Am.* V, XIII, XXXIII, LXV, LXXX, LXXXV, and less markedly *Am.* II, XVII, XXVII, XXXI, XXXII, XXXVIII, LV.

[3] The similarity to Desportes' sonnet beginning 'Marchands' (*Diane* I, xxxii) has been pointed out by H. Littledale (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. VI, p. 203). He fails to note that it had been pointed out before by L. E. Kastner and by Sidney Lee.

and pure (see *Teares of the Muses*, Erato, ll. 383—96; *Hymne to Love*, ll. 169—89; *Colin Clout*, ll. 782—90).

The fourth and last parallel (*Am.* LXIV with *Epi.* X), though Mr Smith fails to note the fact, was dealt with in my paper (p. 261, *n.*) because it had been advanced by Todd. It is unfortunately even less in point than the rest; for the sonnet deals with odours, the stanza with things visible. The impossibility of grounding an argument here is evident when in the sonnet we read that the lady's sapphire eyes resemble 'pincks.'

In short, the comparison reduces itself to red lips and cheeks, blue eyes, and a white bosom. 'Hath white and red in it such wondrous powre?' (*Hymne to Beautie*, l. 71). One may add that both have a smile like sunshine (*Am.* X and *Epi.* 119) and 'golden tresses' (*Am.* XV, XXXVII, LXXII, and *Epi.* 154). But yellow hair and sunshine smiles are no less conventional than ivory foreheads. Rosalind of the *Shepherd's Calendar* had 'golden locks' (June, l. 46); so has Spenser's figure of abstract beauty (*Hymne to Beautie*, ll. 92—105), and her eyes are also 'a parcell of the purest skie.' The less such comparisons are sought in the field of objective realizations of the poet's vision, and the more in his abstract conceptions of love and beauty (both in the *Hymnes* and the *Faerie Queene*), the ampler will be the investigator's reward.

As final evidence that Spenser inserted later sonnets to his 'real flame,' Mr Smith urges that some are convincingly 'loverlike' and 'matter-of-fact.' But the circumstance that Spenser must have addressed Lady Carey without aspirations toward marriage does not necessitate the absence of a semblance of physical attraction. Platonic love did not demand such austerity. In point of fact certain sonnets (*Am.* X, LXVIII), which Mr Smith will perhaps admit were addressed to Lady Carey[1], are certainly not less intimate than the few he mentions. Altogether, it is inapt to draw a distinction between 'the real and the imaginary courtship' (p. 277) in view of the way that love-making and marriage were then conducted in court circles. What contemporary sonnet sequence have we that was addressed to the poet's future wife? Was Sidney's courtship of Stella 'imaginary,' and that of Frances Walsingham 'real'? Sixteenth-century passions must be read in the light of sixteenth-century ideals: Prior and Spenser had very different conceptions of Platonic love.

Nor is it reasonable to discount the evidence of Spenser's dedication of *Muiopotmos* by speaking of its 'comparative ardour' (p. 276). It is superlative. One could hardly say more than: 'I have determined to give my selfe wholy to you, as quite abandoned from my selfe, and absolutely vowed to your service.' This is quite another matter than his addresses to her sisters: 'To intimate my humble affection to your Ladiship' (*Teares of the Muses*, Ded.), or 'To make knowen to your Ladiship the humble affection and faithfull duetie which I have alwaies

[1] The first, because of its likeness to the sonnet to Lady Carey (see also the *Hymne to Love*, ll. 148—61); and the second, because it is an Easter sonnet, and therefore an integral portion of the structure.

professed, and am bound to beare, to that house from whence yee spring' (*Mother Hubberds Tale*, Ded.). The dedication to Lady Carey, unmistakable as a vow of service offered by a courtly lover (compare *Am.* LXXXII), places Spenser's ostensible, and therefore at least well feigned, devotion in 1590 beyond discussion[1].

Something might be made, indeed, of the fact that in the sonnets the stages of the lover's progress are well marked, were this unique. But, however 'matter-of-fact,' they are not clearer, except as regards chronological indications, than in Watson's *Hecatompathia*, or in Spenser's other conspicuous literary model, *Astrophel and Stella*[2]. As to the chronology, it will be remarked that the stages are sometimes suggestive of literary artifice; for example, where the lady yields, as a kind of New Year's resolution, immediately after the New Year (*Am.* LXII, LXIII). It is to be borne in mind that, in the *Shepheardes Calendar*, Spenser had already known how to suit his passions to the characteristics of the months. And for this reason a similar suspicion rests on the wedding date (June 11th):

> But for this time it ill ordained was,
> To chose the longest day in all the yeare,
> And shortest night, when longest fitter weare.
> (*Epi.*, ll. 270—2.)

This literary use of occasions is evident again in bidding the lady of the sonnets (*Am.* LXX), 'Her selfe soone ready make To wayt on Love amongst his lovely crew.' Mr Smith would render this as 'getting ready for the wedding.' Rather, being in the second sonnet after Easter, this is an allusion to May day.

It should now be abundantly evident that the eighteenth-century assumption of the physical identity of the ladies of the *Amoretti* and the *Epithalamion* remains baseless. I must charge to my own lack of explicitness the misapprehensions into which Mr Smith, by my fault, has been led. His opinion on all matters concerning Spenser will command the attention of those familiar with his excellent work as an editor of the *Faerie Queene*.

PERCY W. LONG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The date of Spenser's marriage becomes disengaged from the foregoing contentions, since neither Mr Smith nor I regards Spenser's courtly and domestic love-making as synchronous. I suggested an early date (pp. 262—3) because Spenser's praise of three Elizabeths (*Am.* LXXIV) must seem incongruous if he had just courted and married a fourth—Elizabeth Boyle. It offered 'the only present escape from this dilemma' (p. 263) because the courtship of Lady Carey is patent and the marriage with Elizabeth Boyle rests on evidence which must be given face value, albeit reluctantly. Grosart's evidence of it in his edition of Spenser

[1] No promise of further work is made in the dedication because Spenser therein states that he is engaged in it. One is made, however, as I noted (p. 259) at the close of the appended series of visions, which, in the original issue of the *Complainte*, form part of the sub-division addressed to Lady Carey. It is for this reason that the sonnet following the sixth and last of the *Visions of Petrarch* is in the quarto *not* numbered 7.

[2] That here the final separation may have had a basis in fact is borne out by the omission of the sonnet to Lady Carey in the 1596 edition of the *Faerie Queene*.

proved entirely inconclusive, and the later surprising, tortuous evidence in *The Lismore Papers*—difficult and fragmentary as they are—leaves one who is familiar with Grosart's publications not sure that it is devoid of flaws (see *Anglia*, 1908, p. 83; also *The Lismore Papers*, I, i, xiv). It is desirable that a competent scholar, versed in palaeography, go over this ground. The suggestion of an early date was made less to further the cause of Lady Carey, than as an offering to Zoilus.

Nevertheless, Mr Smith here does me some injustice. I did not claim 'five children' (p. 276) for Spenser. I said (p. 262): 'Four, possibly five.' I now say: 'Four, very likely five'; for, far from discounting the evidence of Jonson that one of Spenser's children perished in the sack of Kilcolman, I regard it as highly trustworthy on account of his and Spenser's equally close connexion with Essex and Bacon. The sack was a matter likely to be talked of in that circle, at a time when Bacon's ambition was turning toward Ireland. Their friendship with Camden offers another connecting link. But, in any case, the *probabilities* are against even four children in four years and four months of married life.

Secondly, I did not argue that 'Sylvanus was not a minor in 1603.' Grosart says that the court record shows him appearing for himself. To disregard this is useless, since in 1605–6 there are several others to confirm it. If a marriage in 1581 is impossible, as Mr Smith avers (p. 277)—and no less so in 1583–4—why may he not suppose two marriages instead of twins? He would have in support of this the interesting argument of J. P. Collier. Otherwise, it must be admitted that the court records are due to a carelessness natural enough in an unsettled country in the case of a lad arrived at years of discretion (fourteen), but hardly so in the case of a child of eight. Most of Mr Smith's points in objection fall if this age is assumed, permitting a marriage in 1588. He can then depend solely on an assumption that the *Epithalamion* was really written, as the publisher's advertisement implies, 'not long before' 1594. For Spenser's official faithfulness to Rosalind in 1591 proves nothing: he is equally faithful at the time of the publication of *Colin Clout* in 1595, certainly after his marriage. Nor is it clear that the opening of the *Epithalamion* must be, as Mr Smith states (p. 277) without evidence, 'subsequent at least to the first instalment of the *Faerie Queene*, to *Daphnaida*, and to the *Ruines of Time*.' I cannot discern in it any specific allusion to these poems. He might have noted that 'When ye list your owne mishaps to mourne' (l. 7) *does* allude to *The Teares of the Muses*; but that is commonly regarded as an early work. To be sure, the publisher's statement—a very different thing from the absent poet's statement—remains; but its force is lost when one recalls that a number of 'lost poems' of the period of 1580 remained unprinted. 'Written not long since' may have served merely to indicate that the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion* were not among the poems which had been written 'long since'—some fifteen years before. The phrase is not equivalent to *newly*: it implies some interval.

The year of Spenser's marriage remains uncertain.

John Donne, Diplomatist and Soldier.

In *The Modern Language Review*, VI, 153, Professor Grierson suggests that the John Donne of my extracts from the accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber for 1597—8 (*M. L. Review*, V, 492) was not the poet, but the 'Mr Done' recommended to Essex by Cecil in January, 1599 for services in Ireland. If he will pursue his researches in the *Cecil Papers* (e.g. XI, 419, to take a sample reference noted by me, while preparing my communication of October last, for use in case this suggestion should be made) he will, I think, find that the Mr Done of 1599 was probably Captain Hugh Done.

E. K. Chambers.

Gerrard's Cross.

REVIEWS.

Satiro-Mastix or the Untrussing of the Humorous Poet. By THOMAS DEKKER. Herausgegeben nach dem Drucken von 1602 von HANS SCHERER. (*Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, Band XX.) Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1907. 8vo. xvi + 136 pp.

All students of Elizabethan drama owe a debt of gratitude to the editor of this series for having decided to publish a critical and trustworthy edition of this most interesting and valuable play. It is, indeed, strange that *Satiromastix* should have waited so long for a satisfactory edition. Apart from its primary importance in the history of the War of the Theatres, it is a very mine of allusions to contemporary life and manners, especially to things theatrical, and it gives us an insight of peculiar value into the character and dramatic methods of one of the most charming personalities of his time. Yet except for the eighteenth century edition of Hawkins, which by no means satisfies the requirements of the modern student, and is not easily procurable, the only complete edition of the play hitherto is that included in the *Dramatic Works of Dekker*, edited by the late R. H. Shepherd in 1873. And this edition, like most of the work of Shepherd, is equally unsatisfactory to the scholar and the general reader. Professor Bang and Dr Scherer may therefore well be congratulated on having met an obvious want in our collections of the Elizabethan drama.

The main service that Dr Scherer has rendered us in this edition is the presentation of an accurate and reliable text. He has based it upon the text of what he calls Q_1, of which a word hereafter, adopting the corrections which appear in Q_2. He has retained the old spelling, except in cases of evident misprints, and the original punctuation except where he has felt himself bound to correct it. Personally I am not sure that I approve of this method. For the purposes of the scholar I am inclined to think that an exact reprint of one of the old copies of the play, recording in foot-notes, or text-notes, the variant readings of other copies and the emendations of modern editors, would be preferable. As soon as the revising hand of an editor is laid upon the text itself, uncertainty creeps in and inconsistencies are bound to occur. In several cases Dr Scherer has retained what seem to me very obvious misprints, while correcting others about which there may be some dispute[1].

[1] Thus, for example, in l. 859 he retains the reading 'your hot beautie's melt,' without note or comment. In l. 1424 he follows the obvious mistake of the old printer in printing

And this leads me to another point which I think is worthy of notice. Dr Scherer states, p. xiv, that there is one copy in the Bodleian. There are, however, two, one with a torn title-page, Malone, B. 166, the other, evidently the copy inspected by Dr Scherer, bearing the press-mark M. 235. The first lacks a leaf, sig. b. 4, but is otherwise complete, and as a rule corresponds exactly to the other copy. It contains, for example, the readings *Mon Dieu* for *Mon du*, l. 2480, and *Tam* or *Cham* (the proper names are in italics, not in roman, as Dr Scherer gives them on p. 79) for *Tamor Cham*, l. 2490, on the basis of which Dr Scherer proposes to divide the four copies he has inspected into two groups, the first containing the copies in the British Museum, showing, he believes, an old state of the text, the second, containing the copies in the Dyce collection and the Bodleian (i.e. M. 235), a partially corrected text. But I have noted seven instances, ll. 863, 995, 1003, 1012, 1025, 1029 f. and 1998, where the imperfect copy at the Bodleian agrees with the reading of the British Museum copies and not with the other copy at the Bodleian. In four of these Dr Scherer prefers the reading of the British Museum copies (ll. 995, 1003, 1029, and 1998); in l. 1998 the second Bodleian copy (M. 235) appears to stand alone, lacking the support of the Dyce copy which elsewhere, if we may trust Dr Scherer's collations, agrees with it. In five other cases, ll. 1274, 1403, 2476, 2481 and 2490, where slight variations appear, Dr Scherer also prefers the supposed older reading, and to these we may, I think, add l. 1408 for punctuation, and the spelling Li*e*ge, rather than Le*i*ge in l. 2322. Does not all this go to show, especially when we take into account the fact that the great majority of these variants are concerned with points of punctuation, and not with real variations in the text, that we have to do here with the usual variants which occur in practically all Elizabethan printings, and not with a more or less systematic attempt at correction, which would permit us to classify the copies in question, and denominate them, as Dr Scherer does on p. xv, Q_1 and Q_2? I can assure Dr Scherer that the variations which he has noted in the copies of *Satiromastix* are considerably less important than those which I have remarked in the various copies of Chapman's *All Fooles* which I have inspected, and yet I should prefer to explain these latter as corrections made by the first printer while copies were being struck off, rather than to assume the existence of two separate editions of the same date; and in this view I am glad to see that I have the support of Mr Greg, who in his *List of English Plays*, notes but one edition of *All Fooles* as of *Satiromastix*.

In fact, until stronger evidence is brought forward, I should decline to believe that the copies of *Satiromastix* so far inspected can even be

'Then' with a capital, whereas the catchword on the preceding page, as he himself notes, gives the true reading, 'then.' I should be glad to know whether 'whorshippe,' l. 1034, is a misprint of the old copies which Dr Scherer has followed, or an accidental misprint of his own. In the former case I would include it among the obvious misprints which might have been corrected, the more so as the Bodleian quartos both read 'worshippe,' a variant not noted by Dr Scherer.

separated into earlier and later states of the same edition. I have only had an opportunity of comparing Dr Scherer's work with the Bodleian copies, but I have found a number of instances in which he either gives or implies a reading of the copy which he inspected there, which is, to speak frankly, non-existent[1].

The impression left upon my mind by a careful collation of Dr Scherer's work with the copy in the Bodleian which he inspected is that he can hardly have given it the careful study which in view of its good condition it deserves, and that he has too often assumed its agreement with the copies in the Museum, and presumably also with the copy in the Dyce collection.

His brief account of this copy on p. xv is not altogether satisfactory. He states: 'Auf dem Titelblatt ist der Namenszug Dekker's oben auf einem Stückchen Papier aufgeklebt. Wer mag der Schreiber desselben sein?' The signature is not pasted on the title-page, but on a blank page, facing the title-page of *Old Fortunatus*, the first play in this volume, M. 235. And according to Madan, *Catalogue of Western MSS*, vol. iv, p. 431, it is an autograph signature of Dekker's. Doubtless Malone 'conveyed' it from some of the old MSS, possibly those in the Dulwich collection, which he had examined, and pasted it in this volume, in which he bound up a number of Dekker's plays. The marginal notes in this copy are certainly, not questionably, by Malone, as may be seen by a comparison with the Malone manuscript letters in the Bodleian. As I have only examined the Bodleian copies, it is possible that Dr Scherer's statements as to vignettes, p. xv, may be correct as regards the other copies, though I should regard it as unlikely. I can state positively that in the Bodleian copies the 'masks' occur on pp. 7 and 93, not 6 and 76, and that they are identical, not different, as Dr Scherer's words imply.

A few further points in regard to the text remain to be noted. In l. 92 the Bodleian copies appear to read 'ietting,' though the *i* might possibly be mistaken for a broken *f*. This reading, which by the way was followed by Hawkins, gives a much better sense than 'setting,' and is doubtless correct. What meaning does Dr Scherer attach to 'setting'?

[1] Thus his note on l. 198 leads us to suppose that the reading of all Qq is *Prickeshaft.*, whereas the Bodleian copies have no punctuation after this word. In l. 433 he notes that 'stray' may be a misprint for 'stay,' but prefers to retain it in his text. But both Bodleian copies have 'sttay,' a palpable misprint corrected by Hawkins in the first reprint of the play. In l. 464 he gives 'struie' as the reading of all copies; both Bodleian copies have correctly 'striue.' In l. 682 the Bodleians have no punctuation after *Exeunt*; in l. 704 they lack the periods after '*Sir*' and '*Vaug*'; in l. 1006 the periods after '*Sir*' and '*Adam*' which Dr Scherer notes as found in all copies. In l. 1050 both Bodleians give the true reading 'shall be,' whereas Dr Scherer gives 'shall he' as the reading of all copies, and prints 'shall be' as an emendation of his own. In ll. 1310, 1312 and 1578 Dr Scherer charges all copies with the misprint of a period after 'Sir,' but in all these cases the Bodleians show a correct reading. In l. 2018 the Bodleian copies both have the misprint 'cheekcs,' which he gives as the reading of the Museum copies only. Likewise in l. 2630 they agree with the Museum copies in the misprint 'wlll.' These are all trifles, except perhaps the case of l. 1050; but since Dr Scherer has thought it worth while to record them in his Text Notes, it is as well that they should be corrected.

In ll. 406 and 414 Dr Scherer retains the old reading 'Faninus,' though he remarks, p. 88, that it may be a misprint, rather than an intentional distortion of the name. It is almost certainly a misprint, as are 'Fanninus' in l. 600, and 'Flannius' in l. 450.

The punctuation proposed by Dr Scherer (p. 101) for ll. 1026–7 is such an improvement on the old, that I think he might have introduced it into the text, especially as Hawkins here retains the confusing punctuation of the quartos.

In l. 1335 Dr Scherer's emendation 'our' for 'out' is probably correct. Hawkins retained the old, but I doubt whether a satisfactory sense can be obtained from it without wresting the language. On the other hand in l. 1584 I am not sure that he is justified in introducing 'hansomely,' for 'sansomely' into the text. The old form may be one of the Welshman's distortions of the Queen's English, though I have not noted any parallels to it. Hawkins here keeps the old form. So in l. 1408 I should prefer, like Hawkins, to keep the punctuation 'so, tis,' found in what Dr Scherer calls the older group of the quartos, to 'so tis' given by the other group, for 'so' is surely an interjection.

In l. 1509 Dr Scherer, like Hawkins, prints 'Sering' and does not consider that the unusual word calls for any comment. I am strongly inclined to think it a misprint for 'string.' In ll. 1562–4 Tucca, the speaker in the present passage, calls Asinius, of whom 'Sering' is here used, a 'Lute-stringe' and threatens to use his legs as tags. The word 'string,' would, therefore, suit the context perfectly. Dr Bradley, whom I have consulted on this passage, suggests that 'Sering' may be the variant of 'Syringe' which appears in Rowland's *Greene's Ghost*, p. 8, and Vicary's *Anatomy*, p. 189 (E. E. T. S.). But the passage referred to above, ll. 1562–4, confirms me in the opinion that 'string' and not 'syringe' was the word in Dekker's mind.

After l. 1782 there should be, I think, either in the text or in the notes an indication of the exit of Sir Vaughan with Tucca. Neither Dr Scherer nor Hawkins mark this.

There can be no doubt but that Dr Scherer is right in rejecting Hawkins' proposal to assign l. 1892 to Tucca. It is, of course, an aside by Horace. On the other hand he takes no notice of Hawkins' emendation 'delude me not' for 'delude we not' in l. 2390 which seems to me an almost certain one. It is at least worth recording.

From his punctuation and comment I should be inclined to think that Dr Scherer has not quite understood l. 2348. I take it that the king first speaks of the corpse as 'Death's motion,' then addresses the corpse with the question, 'motionless?' and finally turns to Terrill and Sir Adam with the words, 'speak you.' Dr Scherer puts a comma after 'motion' (the quartos have either a colon or a semi-colon) which seems to me, when taken along with his note on p. 124, to indicate that he understands the sense of the passage to be: 'This is Death's motion [which is] motionless.' Such a rendering does not seem to me to be warranted by the old punctuation, which Dr Scherer has altered, and it is certainly less effective than that which I take the old punctuation to convey.

Dr Scherer gives the whole speech ll. 2543–8 to Sir Vaughan, departing in this both from the quartos and from Hawkins, on the ground that the phrase 'by Jesu,' l. 2547, shows it to be by the Welshman. It seems plain to me, however, that the first lines of this speech belong to Tucca. In l. 2532 Crispinus has pronounced the sentence that Horace shall be crowned with nettles. Tucca has asked some one of the company to hand him, Tucca, this crown, and he now forces it upon the poet's head with the words 'this Biggin is yours.' Had Sir Vaughan spoken these words we should almost certainly have had 'piggin.' Sir Vaughan's part of this speech should begin, I think, with the words, 'nay by Sesu,' l. 2547, and the presence of a dash (—) in the quartos before these words adds likelihood to this conjecture. Possibly the first words of Sir Vaughan's speech were illegible in the MS that lay before the printer, who therefore omitted them and ran his speech into Tucca's immediately preceding.

The Introduction is divided into four parts, the first of which deals with Dekker's share in the 'Stage-Quarrel.' It is in the main based upon the work of Small, whose views Dr Scherer adopts, with the exception of the idea that Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* was a contribution to the controversy. Dr Scherer is to be congratulated on the decision with which he has managed to avoid the complications introduced into the account of this quarrel by earlier writers on the subject, but it is unfortunate that he should have added a note, p. vii, which reveals a complete misunderstanding of an utterance of Swinburne. He refers to the late poet's article in the *Nineteenth Century*, vol. xxi, to show 'was alles in den Satiromastix hineingeheimnisst wurde: Rufus sollte Shakespeare sein, Vaughan—Lyly, Tucca—Sir Phil. Sidney, Bubo—Bacon, Flash—Sir W. Raleigh, Cælestine—Queen Elizabeth.' No one who is at all familiar with Swinburne's writings on Elizabethan drama can for an instant suspect him of holding the views here attributed to him; but there are doubtless students of the drama on the Continent and elsewhere who are less familiar than they should be with the poet-critic's brilliant essays, and it would seem an act of piety to clear his memory of this aspersion. As a matter of fact Swinburne, after stating that a modern critic (Cartwright, in *Shakespeare and Jonson*, 1864) identifies William Rufus with Shakespeare and Sir Vaughan with Lyly, goes on to suggest 'a little further development on the principle of analogy.' 'It is equally obvious,' he says, 'that the low-bred and foul-mouthed ruffian, Captain Tucca, must be meant for Sir Philip Sidney; the vulgar idiot, Asinius Bubo, for Lord Bacon; the half-witted underling, Peter Flash, for Sir Walter Raleigh, and the immaculate Cælestine...for Queen Elizabeth.' The epithets alone might have warned Dr Scherer that Swinburne was speaking ironically. But Dr Scherer does not seem very quick to recognise the use of irony in serious discussion of scholarly problems. I cannot help thinking that on p. xiii he has been misled in the same fashion by an ironical remark on the part of Small to the effect that he supposes 'some one will soon try to identify Asinius Bubo (who

corresponds to Simplicius Faber in Marston's *What You Will*) with Wentworth Smith.' Dr Scherer remarks gravely 'vielleicht wird seine Identität (i.e. Bubo-Faber's) mit dem ziemlich unbekannten Theaterdichter Wentworth Smith noch einmal festgestellt.' It is not in the least likely. Smith was a playwright in Henslowe's employ, 1601–3, who collaborated with Day, Chettle, Munday, Dekker and others, never so far as we know with Jonson. We should expect to find him then in the group of the poetasters rather than in the train of the humorous poet. The satellite of Jonson caricatured by Marston and Dekker must have been, *pace* Swinburne, a gentleman gull; he could not have been a hack playwright.

In one other instance Dr Scherer, it seems to me unconsciously, misrepresents a statement of an earlier writer on the subject. He states that W. H. Browne believes that the phrase 'his belly is like Barathrum' entitles us to find the prototype of Tucca in the Maenius of Horace. This is not quite accurate. Browne holds that Jonson's Tucca is a composite character, the bullying wheedling 'scurra' of Horace with a vocabulary of abuse modelled, perhaps, on that of Capt. Hannam. He refers only supplementarily to the phrase above quoted from the *Poetaster*, which seems to him a reminiscence of Horace, *Ep.* I, xv, 31. In the main I am rather inclined to agree with Dr Scherer than with Mr Browne, for the similarity between Tucca and Maenius seems to me to be of the slightest. As to the phrase in question it is curious that neither Mr Browne nor Dr Scherer note that it is not used in relation to Tucca, but used by him of a certain 'eating player.' I think it quite possible that Jonson, true disciple of Horace as he was, may have lifted the phrase from his master. The examples which Dr Scherer quotes to show the common use of the word 'barathrum' at this time are all later than the *Poetaster*, and with the exception of a passage in the *Furnivall Ballads*, where the word means the pit of hell, Jonson seems to have been the first to employ it in English, and it was Jonson's use of the word which made it current in Elizabethan drama.

In the second division of the Introduction I would note that the playwright's name is spelt 'Decker,' not 'Dekker,' in the S. R. entry. Another misprint on this page should also be corrected: in note 2, for 195 read 76. In regard to the date of composition of *Satiromastix*, Dr Scherer, relying mainly upon two comments of Prof. Bang, is inclined to set the *terminus ad quem* as late as December 1601. This is later than the recorded entry of the play in S. R., and while I do not deny the possibility of the entry of a work before its actual completion, I should prefer stronger evidence than is here offered before I would accept this as likely in the case of *Satiromastix*. Prof. Bang's arguments are 'the repeated allusions' to Christmas, which lead him to believe that this play was written for performance in the holidays, and an allusion to the Lady Furnivall mentioned in *Sir Gyles Goosecappe*, which Dr Scherer converts into an allusion to this play, of which the *terminus a quo* is Sept. 14, 1601. This is, I think, a non-sequitur on

Dr Scherer's part. Lady Furnivall, of whom I have spoken in my paper on the authorship of *Sir Gyles Goosecappe* (in *Modern Philology*, vol. IV), was apparently a familiar, not to say notorious, character in the London of Chapman and Dekker, and Dekker's mention of her in *Satiromastix* by no means implies the previous existence of *Goosecappe* on the boards. As to the 'repeated allusions' they turn out on inspection to be two, *Satiromastix*, ll. 1587 and 2510. In the second of these Tucca says to Horace: 'you and your itchy poetry break out like Christmas but once a year.' Bearing in mind the old saying 'Christmas comes but once a year,' and Jonson's alleged practice of producing one play a year, can anyone really regard this passage as bearing upon the date of composition of *Satiromastix*? The earlier passage with the phrase 'now at Christmas' seems at first sight to indicate a performance of this play in the holidays, but the whole phrase looks to me very like a gag inserted by the actor who played Vaughan during a holiday performance. *Satiromastix* no doubt held the boards as late as the Christmas holidays of 1601, but that is not to say that it was written for a performance at that season. As for the phrase in the *Epilogus*, 'this colde weather,' which Dr Scherer adduces to support a wintry date for the composition, cold weather is not so uncommon in an English autumn that we must conclude from such a phrase that the speaker is referring to a performance in the Christmas holidays. But after all, the approximate date of *Satiromastix* is closely enough determined by its entry in the Stationers' Register.

The third section deals with the sources of the play, and presents in a brief and satisfactory fashion all that is known of the materials from which Dekker composed this amusing medley of romance, farce, and personal satire. I have already said all that is necessary of the editor's account of the quartos and of earlier editions in my remarks on the text.

Dr Scherer's notes (pp. 81—131) are copious and interesting. They are especially useful by reason of their frequent cross-references to parallel passages in Elizabethan literature, particularly the drama. This is, I believe, one of the surest ways of obtaining definite results in still unsettled questions of authorship. The more we realize that a certain number of words, phrases, proverbs, etc., were the common stock of the writers of the time, the more surely we shall be able to discriminate the peculiar characteristics of each author, the element which makes a play, or perhaps a scene or two in a play, his own, and not another's.

Satiromastix is, of course, crowded with allusions to the contemporary drama, many of which are noted by Dr Scherer. Occasionally, however, his desire to discover such allusions seems to me to have led him too far. When Tucca addresses Mistress Miniver as Susanna, l. 1145, for example, it is not likely that the name of the chaste Jewess was particularly suggested by the old play, *The Comedy of Susanna*, 1578. References to Dives, l. 1115, and Lazarus, l. 1951, do not imply a knowledge on Tucca's or Dekker's part of the old 'moral dialogue,' or the old play, mentioned by Scherer in his notes on these lines. The latter

note seems to me somewhat confusing: one would hardly guess from it that the play in question, *Dives and Lazarus*, was one belonging to the company of strolling players who appear in the anonymous play *Sir Thomas More*[1]. Once or twice Dr Scherer anticipates, and sees allusions where for chronological reasons none are possible. Thus Dekker could not have had in mind the first two lines of Jonson's Prologue to *Everyman in his Humour* when writing l. 2425, since the Prologue first appeared in the folio edition of Jonson in 1616. Nor is it likely that Tucca when using the word 'whirligig,' l. 2489, was thinking of Sharpham's *Cupid's Whirligig*, 1606–7. Sharpham's career as a dramatist appears to begin about 1605, i.e. four years after the composition of *Satiromastix*. The phrase, 'Ist a match or no match' can hardly be an allusion to Rowley's lost play *A Match or No Match*, since this was licensed by Herbert in 1624. I note these instances merely to show that Dr Scherer has sometimes given us 'zu viel des guten.' Once or twice on the other hand he has omitted a reference to contemporary plays that might have been given, for example in l. 1659 to *Huon of Bordeaux*, a play mentioned by Henslowe in 1593, or in l. 2625 to the appearance of a character named Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost* and Marston's *What You Will*.

There are, naturally, other omissions in the notes. One editor will pass over in silence what another would wish to explain. Personally I should have liked to see a note on the meaning of such unfamiliar words as 'Lungis,' l. 685, 'flawne,' l. 1773, and 'graines,' l. 2482, especially on the last of these, for which no appropriate meaning appears in the *New English Dictionary*. Dr Scherer does not note the employment by Bubo of technical terms drawn from the language of the Universities in ll. 951 f., 'proceede Poetaster next Commencement if I have my grace'; nor the connection between 'clip' and 'treason' in l. 1913, which might have been illustrated by a passage from Shakespeare, *Henry V*, IV, i, 246 ff., ''Tis no English treason to cut French crowns, and tomorrow the King himself will be a clipper.'

Somewhat more serious than these omissions are the positive errors into which Dr Scherer has now and then fallen. The identification of Rosamond Clifford, Fair Rosamond, Henry II's mistress, l. 988, with the little lady of ten to thirteen years who appears in Miss Edgeworth's *Early Lessons* and its sequel, *Rosamond*, is enough to make that charming moralist turn in her grave. 'Mum,' l. 1576, cannot possibly equal 'Pst!'; it is a verb, not an interjection, and apparently is an abbreviation, unknown to the *New English Dictionary*, of 'mum-chance,' a game of dice. The phrase, 'my little Cutlers shoppe,' l. 1654, is not addressed to Asinius, but to Tucca's boy, 'laden with swords and bucklers,' l. 1611 f., who is here invited to display his wares to Asinius, that the latter may chose from them weapons for the combat to which Tucca has challenged him. 'Mermaid,' l. 1671, does not allude to the famous tavern, but like 'Squirrel,' l. 1670 (for which see

[1] See Brooke, *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 403.

Small, *The Stage Quarrel*, p. 135) is a cant term for a prostitute. 'Shoulder-clappers,' l. 1675, are not false friends, but sergeants who arrest debtors, as Dr Scherer might have gathered from the reference which he himself cites from Dekker's *Hornbook*. I cannot believe that there is any reference to the Cambridge printer, Thomas Thomasius, in l. 1732. Tucca, who is addressing a Welshman, gives him a characteristically Welsh name, one of the numerous Welsh duplications, Thomas Thomas, John Jones, Griffith Griffiths, etc. Stokes, the author of *An Attempt to discover the chronological order of Shakespeare's plays*, 1878, could not have alluded to *The Wisdom of Dr Doddipol* as far back as 1596, as Dr Scherer certainly implies, in his note on l. 2632. The mistake has arisen apparently from a hasty reading of Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature*, vol. II, p. 89, but mistakes like this have a dangerous trick of perpetuating themselves, and should be corrected. As misprints we may note 'durts' for 'durst,' p. 86, l. 5, 'man' for 'am' in the note on l. 2046, and 'No Whit' for 'No Wit,' p. 129, l. 1. The reference to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* in the note on l. 1064 should read II, i, 1, 2, and the citation from *Engl. Stud.* (p. 97, last line) should give p. 224, not p. 207.

It is pleasant to turn from such fault-finding as this to commend excellent notes like those on ll. 1287 and 2446, where Dr Scherer really throws new light upon the meaning of the text, and to close with the assurance that in spite of its minor faults Dr Scherer's edition is one which should be on the shelves of all students of the Elizabethan drama.

T. M. Parrott.

Princeton, U.S.A.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. v. The Drama to 1642, Part I. Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8vo. xiii + 508 pp.

The appearance of two new volumes, the fifth and sixth, of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* is an event of the first importance in the world of criticism, not only because the work appears under auspices so august, but because ostensibly it brings to bear upon this most important subject the orderly cooperation of those who may be presumed to be best fitted to set forth the most recent progress of criticism and research in this wide field. It is a difficult thing thus to combine in an organised whole the independent investigations of so many scholars, and this excellent work is not exempt from the limitations that inhere in all cooperative books. But no one can deny that with such tried and experienced leaders as Dr Ward and Mr Waller this work has been well ordered and competently conducted, and its design and proportions for the most part admirably preserved. Moreover, without invidious distinctions, these later volumes seem notable among those that have hitherto appeared.

The fifth volume, to which for the present we may confine our attention, includes the earlier half of that bewildering growth of our literature known as the Elizabethan Drama and in fourteen chapters by nearly as many contributors discusses English drama from its origin to Shakespeare and the lesser playwrights more immediately surrounding him. After competent discussions by Dr Ward himself of the liturgical and other origins of English drama and by Mr Harold Child of the earlier secular influences upon it, Professor Creizenach contributes an informing chapter on the miracle-plays and moralities. It is of interest, in view of the very recent discussion of this subject by Professors Manly and Wood who come to an opposite conclusion, that Professor Creizenach holds to the English rather than the Dutch origin of *Elckerlijc—Everyman.* Nothing could be better than Professor Creizenach's remarks on the original purposes of the miracle-play as affecting its character and conduct. Professor Cunliffe's chapter on early English tragedy, which immediately follows, contributes more new material to the general subject than almost any other of the book, and is especially commendable (a praise not equally to be bestowed everywhere in this volume) for its full and explicit references to authorities. There can hardly arise a question in a work of this completeness and authority as to the desirability of furnishing the student with the fullest possible guides to the statements and conclusions arrived at in the text. Professor Saintsbury in his chapters on Shakespeare scarcely supplies a reference, and perhaps, as he makes no claim to a statement of the present consensus of scholarship on his great theme, but gives us, admirably as we shall see, only his own unaided and uncontaminated ponderings, the omission in his case is justified. Ninety-seven readers in a hundred may not need notes of reference; to the other three they are indispensable, if the work is to serve its purpose fully. It is fair, however, to add, while on this topic, that the excellent Bibliographies, remarkable for their completeness, and the careful Indices, with which each volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* is furnished, justify, for the most part, the reserve which the editors have practised as to the inclusion of foot-references.

The discussion of early comedy by Professor Boas strikes the present reviewer as peculiarly happy, combining as it does a thoroughly competent employment of the most recent scholarship on the subject with a clear apprehension alike of the importance and the unimportance of the exotic beginnings of English comedy. We note but one very minor omission. The name of William Hunnis does not appear in the Index, nor apparently in this chapter. Hunnis is, however, a hypothetically reconstructed dramatist merely, and it is not unlikely that his alleged importance may depend somewhat on the zeal of discovery and reiteration. Of course Mrs Stopes' new book on Hunnis came out too late to be utilised by Professor Boas. Professor Baker, whose work on Lyly, like his other excellent work in the broader fields of our drama at large, has long been favourably known, was precisely

the man into whose hands to entrust Lyly and the poets immediately surrounding him. We somewhat regret that Professor Baker has chosen to perpetuate for this group the rather unfortunate designation, 'the University Wits,' years ago sanctioned by Professor Saintsbury. However, since Shakespeare's most important predecessors were so dubbed *en masse*, Kyd has fallen out, because it is now found that he went to no University, and Marlowe, also, though why? Marlowe assuredly was both a wit—in the antiquated sense in which this word is here used—and a University man as well. Nashe's touch with the drama was really very slight: collaboration in one tragedy with Marlowe, a lost Latin comedy, and an English play which turns out to be little more than a masque—this is all. However Nashe was most truly the wit among them all and his personal association assuredly places him here. We are glad to find Professor Baker recognising—as he certainly would—the 'exquisite feeling for the value of words' which peculiarly belongs to Peele. Strange to say, no one could find out from the mere reading of the text of this chapter just what was the order of Lyly's plays or to what extent they were similarly or variously euphuistic or allegorical. But perhaps we must come to agree with the recent discovery of Mr Lang 'that in all such books' (he is speaking of histories of literature) 'there is repetition of matter known to the humblest examinees.' And possibly the omission of some of the things that Mr Lang is so weary of knowing may be a step in the right direction.

Professor G. Gregory Smith in his paragraphs on Marlowe presents an evident attempt to treat a subject, long staled with repetition and misconception, in a manner somewhat new. To this end he dismisses with the barest mention the famous legend of Marlowe's death with his repute as an atheist and other slanders. We should have liked, in so important a work, a statement of the flimsy evidences on which these tales were based, together with a recognition that, whether Marlowe met Francis Kett at Cambridge or not, the heterodox opinions which the poet held and those for which Kett was burnt at the stake were in reality much of the same stripe, and theologically unorthodox rather than strikingly blasphemous or atheistical. Marlowe the man (of whom Professor Smith seems to think that we know quite as much as we know of Shakespeare) still needs a candid and unbiassed appreciation. In his account of the works of Marlowe, and the range of his activity, Professor Smith shows a tendency to set up standards for Marlowe's art and then to exclude whatever falls below them. In closer accord than elsewhere with usually accepted criticism, he denies to Marlowe's authorship the rude and boisterous comedy scenes of *Faustus*, a denial, when all is said, wholly gratuitous, and based upon a preconception of the limitations of Marlowe's art. Indeed the very crudeness of these scenes should be an argument that they are the comedy of a genius essentially tragic. Though to the confusion of the critics, these scenes as actually staged of late years not only in England but at Princeton, U.S.A., and Göttingen, Germany, serve their purpose

exceedingly well, and their very futility and vanity add by contrast to the total effect of this poignant and affecting drama. Marlowe, with all his genius, is really a very unequal poet; and while his career was much too short and ungoverned to exhibit those processes of orderly growth that critics like to dilate on, surely more than difference in theme is necessary to account for the unquestioned restraint and dramatic conception of *Edward II* as compared not only with *Tamburlane* but with *Faustus* and *The Jew of Malta* as well. We cannot agree that there was 'no younger or more mature Marlowe.'

Some of the *obiter dicta* of this chapter, too, call for comment. It is impossible, for example, to accept the statement that 'Marlowe's merit as the beginner of the history play so-called, lies in his humanising of the puppets of the *Kinge Johan* type.' That humanising process had been in progress nearly a decade by the time Marlowe reached his *Edward II*. Again, *The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England*, far from supplying 'a link between the older *King John* by Bale and the later by Shakespeare,' has really nothing in common with the old morality save the topic, but is responsible for the whole conduct of Shakespeare's play, and for a suggestion of most of the personages. And how can it be affirmed, in comparison with this vigorous old play, that Peele's crude piece of journalistic writing, *Edward I*, marks any possible 'breaking with the dull habit of the chronicle play.' Indeed Professor Smith goes still further in these matters, which are unnecessary to the decision of his case, and doubts the very existence of the chronicle history as a separate genre. With equal cogency may we doubt the existence of the tragedy of revenge, the comedy of manners or the farce of situation. There was clearly an unusual interest taken by the England of Marlowe in stories of the nation's past. This interest came with the awakening of the national consciousness, due, amongst other things, to the sense of solidarity and isolation which the separation from Rome and the repulse of Spanish aggression gave to the English people. The chronicle play was only one of several varieties of literature in which this national spirit disclosed itself. To deny the existence of the genre, in view of the group of some one hundred or more dramas, extant and lost, in which this spirit is discernible is to deny ascertained historical fact, and this notwithstanding the circumstance that these dramas mingle other motifs with the national and patriotic one and shade imperceptibly into tragedy of biographical intent (*Richard III*, *Cromwell*), plays of the domestic type (the Shore story in Heywood's *Edward IV*), or even comedies of disguise (*Look About You*). Professor Gregory Smith's paragraphs on Kyd are more orthodox, even though he prefers to place *Soliman and Perseda* before *The Spanish Tragedy* in point of date. Helpful is his statement of the position of Kyd as 'almost exclusively historical,' his frank denial of that poet's claim as a writer of great literature, and his affirmation that Kyd is 'the first English dramatist who writes dramatically.'

The problem that confronts the contributor of any number of

paragraphs on Shakespeare to a work such as this is difficult beyond measure. It is not alone the embarrassment that attends on the mass of comment which learning and ignorance, originality and ineptitude, have added to the highest monument of dross and precious lore ever reared to the memory of any man, it is the greater embarrassment of the stupendous theme itself. Professor Saintsbury has chosen characteristically, and with a right of choice which belongs not to younger and less seasoned critics. A history of literature is not a history of opinion, and it was perhaps better to cut absolutely loose from the notions and investigations of other men than to attempt in any wise to act as an arbiter among them. Yet it is a commentary on the conservatism of scholarship, that a book bearing the imprint of the year that has seen the authentic signatures of the world's greatest poet doubled in number, a definite place of abode assigned to him in London, and the nature of his business relations to the stage made clear, should contain not one word with respect to these interesting discoveries, by no means all of them just made. Why, too, every man who writes about Shakespeare must either begin with the affirmation that we know very little about him or, on the other hand, that we really know very much, is a question in the psychology of criticism that must be left to those interested in such topics. Indeed either affirmation would suffice for almost any historical figure; and Shakespeare's contemporaries in literature, deprived as the poet has been often deprived, of the natural processes of reconstruction and a legitimate weighing of historical probabilities, would fare, most of them, quite as ill biographically as Shakespeare himself. Professor Saintsbury is evidently impatient of the whole subject, and who can blame him? Assuredly his healthy negations are worth a score of 'new-minted' probabilities, and it is refreshing to be told that we do not really 'know' that Shakespeare ever married Anne Hathaway, that Greene ever alluded to Shakespeare as a Shake-scene, or that he was personally acquainted with a single one of those whom Professor Saintsbury persists in calling 'the University Wits.' But what, then, do we 'really know'? And how utterly deplorable it is that, foreseeing all this scepticism and historic doubt of an unbelieving and blaspheming age, Shakespeare could not have forestalled posterity by the association with him in all his movements of two notaries-public to attest under signature and seal every act of his life.

In the vigorous paragraphs that follow, Professor Saintsbury gives us his personal opinions about many things Shakespearean; and the opinions of so tried a scholar are always worthy of serious attention. A recognition of 'the exuberant invention and vivacity' of *The Merry Wives*, a refusal to discredit *Pericles* because of its inequality, an extension of the idea that the inequality of such plays as *Measure for Measure* may be referable to Shakespeare's revising of earlier work of his own—these are some of the many points in which Professor Saintsbury has succeeded in seeing old things at a new angle. Excellent is the discussion of the character of Claudius in *Hamlet*, the justification of the soliloquy, and the appeal from the petty reconstruction of

biographical card houses out of the difficulties of the sonnets, to their sovereign qualities as poetry. Professor Saintsbury always writes precisely as he chooses, and doubtless his long sojourn in 'the Athens of the North' has privileged him in the perpetrations of those offences against Atticism of style that so abound in his pages. *Titus* is described as 'the one play in which (see below) the stiff "single moulded" blank verse line hardly ever—but not never—ruffles itself and grows social.' A well-known underplot is 'the Lorenzo and Jessica "trace-horse" or "outrigger" interest.' 'Shakespeare's Richard *sibi constat* throughout, in weakness as in strength.' Professor Saintsbury loves the 'little Latin' and even the 'less Greek.' Speaking still of *Richard II* he says: 'Of the extreme beauty of the poetry (almost always, however, of the "purple patch" or "fringe" kind and, it would seem, purposely so) in the king's part, it is almost unnecessary to speak.' In *The Merry Wives*, 'Everybody is alive and everything is vividly illuminated—not with the extra-natural, if not non-natural, Congreve rockets, but with a lambent easy light of air.' It is but fair to say that, once through the dangerous breakers that beset the launching of his craft, Professor Saintsbury sails onward in a less turbulent sea. Assuredly to the many congratulations that attend on British birth he may add the circumstance that his idiosyncrasies cannot be pronounced by his critics to be the deplorable consequences of American solecism and barbarism.

It would be difficult to find a more scholarly and thoroughly adequate treatment of the 'Plays of Uncertain Authorship attributed to Shakespeare' than that contained in Dr Moorman's chapter on this theme. Each problem is briefly and fairly stated and each play judicially appraised, with results, which though altogether orthodox, are reached not without independent and informing criticism. We are glad to find Shakespeare not deprived of the delightful and poetic episode of the Countess of Salisbury in *Edward III* nor of his part in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Dr Moorman's hint that Dekker's may be the poetical hand in *The Birth of Merlin* seems happy. Has he considered the possibility that the striking similarities between *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Locrine* may be explained by regarding the latter tragedy as a 'take-off' of the more famous play with its tragic bombast and fury? So Peele ridiculed a certain kind of romance in *The Old Wives Tale*; and Peele was a notorious jester. It is to be regretted that Mr Walder's careful paragraphs on Shakespeare's text should not have taken into account Mr Pollard's convincing analysis of the 'Shakespeare Folios and Quartos' and his theory and that of Greg, now confirmed by Neidig in *Modern Philology*, 'concerning the printing in 1619 of certain of the quartos which bear earlier dates.'

Finally it may be said that Professor Robertson's chapter on 'Shakespeare on the Continent,' with its happy presentation and suggestive generalisations, is perhaps as good as anything in the volume.

This review has already exceeded its due limits. The concluding chapters on the lesser Elizabethan dramatists and the political and

social aspects of the age may be considered with equal advantage in connection with the succeeding volume.

F. E. Schelling.

Philadelphia.

The Kingis Quair and The Quare of Jelusy. Edited by Alexander Lawson. London: A. and C. Black. 1910. 8vo. xcv + 169 pp.

This is an extremely elaborate edition of two poems that have little in common but the word 'Quair' in their titles. The long Preface, extending nearly to 100 pages, is chiefly occupied with the discussion of the question as to whether James I of Scotland was the author of the former poem. It does not seem to be suggested that he was the author of the latter.

New editions of these poems are of course welcome, but it seems a pity that they should have been edited together, as this has at least the appearance of assuming a connexion between them which not only does not exist, but could never have existed. The whole trouble is due to Mr J. T. T. Brown's original attack in 1896 upon the title of King James to the authorship of *The Kingis Quair*, when his object was to bring forward every conceivable argument, relevant or irrelevant, that his ingenuity could suggest. Having discovered that the sole MS. which contained a copy of *The Kingis Quair* also contained a copy of *The Quare of Jelusy*, he suggested that a common authorship of the two poems was possible. The object of the suggestion was palpable, viz. to discredit the former poem by bringing it into connexion with the latter, which could easily be shown to be of a rather late date; whence it would follow that the former is the same. It is sad to find that the present editor has given in his adhesion to this theory, which has really nothing to justify it.

It is not necessary to be a philologist to judge of this question to some extent, though the philological argument, as will presently be shown, is most decisive. It is sufficient to read the poems, that is, if one has no preconceived bias, to see the gulf that separates them. For *The Kingis Quair*, be the author who he may, is at least a pleasing and quite readable poem, as every modern treatise on literature testifies. But *The Quare of Jelusy*, with the exception perhaps of the first hundred lines, which hold out a sort of promise that the poem may be tolerable, is one of the dreariest performances imaginable, one of those miserable things that critics regret that it is their painful duty to read. This, by way of specimen, is what the reader is expected to find agreeable.

> Quho schall me help, allace! for to endite,
> For to be-waill, to compleyne, and to write
> This vice, that now so large is and commoun?
> What sall I say? quhom sall I awite?
> For hie nor law is non estate to quite,
> Now all hath fele of thilkë poysoun.

> Allace! this false and wickit condicioun,
> The lustyhede and euery glade delyte
> Hath of this world full nere ybrought a-doun.

There is plenty more of this tedious stuff, and some of it is worse. In what way it can possibly remind one of *The Kingis Quair*, it would be hard to say.

It is a pity that neither Mr Brown nor the present editor appears to know fully how to handle philological arguments. Professor Lawson says, for example, at p. liii—'Internal evidence is difficult to estimate, for interpretations of literary features are apt to be subjective.' He obviously does not perceive that internal evidence, rightly handled, is a most valuable thing, because it exhibits matters of fact that are so far from being subjective that they appeal to any one who can appreciate facts at all. I proceed to show what I mean by this.

The Kingis Quair abounds with imitations of Chaucer's grammar from end to end. A large number of the lines will only scan if Chaucer's usual rules be observed. The author is not always sound in his use of the final *-e*, but he has a fair notion of it, and is frequently correct. And when a final *-e* is inconvenient, he often contrives (with Chaucer) to provide for its elision, which makes the number of examples less striking.

But how is it with *The Quare of Jelusy*? Mr Brown was so obliging as to collect some of the more obvious examples, at p. 82 of his book, to the number of nine; and adds—'I have purposely selected instances of the use of identical words singled out for comment by Prof. Skeat in his introduction to the *K. Q.*, p. xxvii.' Assuming that this is correct, we see that the author of *The Quare of Jelusy* copies correctly in nine instances. But the fact which is suppressed is that, even if we stretch a point or two, there are only eighteen instances of the final *-e* in the whole poem of 607 lines; whereas in the first 607 lines of *The Kingis Quair* there are at least forty!

Another thing that is suppressed is that the author of *The Quare of Jelusy* frequently forgets all about the matter, and perpetrates such phrases as 'the bricht' instead of 'the brichte' in l. 38, before a consonant; so also 'the derk,' 72; 'this foul' (written 'foule,' but monosyllabic), 182; 'the sad,' 202; 'this fals,' 269; 'this ilk,' 385. The failures of this character in *The Kingis Quair* are much further apart. From such indications as these it is obvious that the dates of these poems must be wide apart instead of near. *The Kingis Quair* belongs to the time when Chaucer's rules were far better understood, certainly to the early part of the fifteenth century; whilst the other must be placed near the end, not only for the preceding reasons, but for the far stronger ones of its atrocious grammar. Thus, at the end of l. 529, we find 'vnknewe,' meaning 'unknown.' The form 'knewe,' for the past participle, will not be found among the four and twenty spellings given in the *N. E. D.*; but it is not a scribal error, for it rimes with 'rewe,' to rue. And observe lines 575—6:

> This fantasy to leve, quhich thou hath tone;
> And furth among gud falouschip thou gone.

What are we to say to 'tone' and 'gone,' which are not scribal errors, for they rime with 'dispone'? 'Tone' is known to be a licentious and objectionable variant of 'tane,' taken; for which, curiously enough, *The Kingis Quair* has only 'take' and 'tak,' and not even 'tan' or 'tane.' 'Gone' is not in the Glossarial Index. The context suggests that it is the imperative, and that 'thou gone' means 'do thou go.' A wondrous form for an imperative!

And surely *The Kingis Quair* has nothing like 'thou hath,' 575, or 'thou helpith,' 312, 'thou feynyth,' 469, 'thou gevith,' 470, 'thou virkith,' 489, 'thou passith,' 553, 'thou suffrith,' 559. Its only error of this kind is 'thou wate,' thou knowest, st. 129; owing to a common confusion between *wot* and *wost*, which is not quite the same thing.

Yet one more decisive difference between the poems is that *The Kingis Quair* never uses 'in-to' for 'in,' as in *The Bruce* and in *The Quare of Jelusy*, *passim*; when 'into' occurs in st. 45, it means 'into.' In st. 117, Prof. Lawson's text has 'into' in l. 6; but the MS. has 'in,' and the metre can be amended otherwise. This simple test is quite independent of the scribe, because the one word has one syllable, and the other has two, and we can count the syllables in the line.

We have every right to protest against the association of two poems so dissimilar in liveliness, in metre, and in grammar. And all for the sake of making a point against the unfortunate King James.

Apart from this protest, upon which, unfortunately, it was necessary to enlarge, we can fully appreciate the pains and trouble which the editor has bestowed upon the work. Particular attention should be given to the Preface, which certainly contains much that is useful. The edition is one which all serious students will welcome, and we have much pleasure in recommending it to their consideration.

Walter W. Skeat.

Cambridge.

The Complete Works of George Gascoigne. Edited by John W. Cunliffe. Vol. II. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8vo. viii + 600 pp.

Professor Cunliffe in this volume completes his valuable edition of Gascoigne's Works, the first part of which was briefly noticed in the *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, p. 130. The present part contains *The Glasse of Government*, *The Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle*, *The Steele Glas* and other poems and prose works, including some pamphlets which have been almost inaccessible—for example *A delicate Diet, for daintiemouthde Droonkardes*, of which a unique copy exists at Britwell Court. It also contains *The Spoyle of Antwerpe*, Gascoigne's authorship of which was not established till Professor Cunliffe satisfied himself by a comparison of Gascoigne's undoubted signature with that of the agent of the English Merchants, that

Gascoigne and the agent were the same man (see *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VI, p. 88). Where more than one edition of a work exists, Professor Cunliffe has taken the first as the basis of his text, occasionally introducing corrections from a later edition. He has executed his difficult and laborious task with great care and with sound judgment. One typographical detail for which he is not responsible suggests criticism. According to the rule by which editors of the *Cambridge English Classics* are governed, deviations in the editor's text from that which he professes to follow are indicated by square brackets. It may be doubted whether the rule is a good one. Words like 'Hyme[n]s' are not pretty to the eye; and the square brackets, though they show that the 'n' is due to the editor, do not show what the text was before the editor altered it. If it be said that the brackets at least direct the reader to the Textual Notes, we may reply that where the editor has altered his text by *omission*, the reader is given no hint of the change. If in such cases the Textual Notes are a sufficient resource, would they not be so equally in cases where the editor has changed his text by addition or substitution? The rule about brackets further introduces a new source of error, for the brackets may be accidentally forgotten, as seems to have been the case with the word 'Universitie' (51. 2) which, according to the rule, should have been printed 'Universiti[e]'! Whether there was any reason for the addition of the 'e' here, one may also doubt. Such spellings as 'ari,' 'glori,' 'studdi,' 'likeli,' abound in Gabriel Harvey's *Letter-book*.

Students of English literature are much indebted to Professor Cunliffe and to the Syndics of the Press for giving them a good text of the works of a writer who has perhaps been too little studied hitherto. If Professor Cunliffe would follow up his textual labours with a monograph on Gascoigne's life and art, their debt to him would be still greater.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

The Oxford Book of Italian Verse. Chosen by St John Lucas. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. 576 pp.

La casa editrice oxoniense ci ha da gran tempo assuefatti ad ammirare i volumi che essa reca in luce, sì che non è meraviglia se il florilegio di liriche italiane, amorevolmente curato dal signor St John Lucas, è riuscito un modello d'eleganza, di nitore e di compattezza.

Il mettere assieme un armonico volume, che contenesse quanto di meglio ha prodotto la musa italica dal secolo decimoterzo al Carducci, non offriva lievi difficoltà, e queste erano accresciute dalla lodevole larghezza di criterio che fece accogliere qui anche quelle opere men polite e perfette che stanno a rappresentare le tendenze diverse favorite volta a volta dai dicitori in rima. Il Lucas seppe superare molte di

tali difficoltà e vorrei mi fosse concesso spazio sufficiente a porre in evidenza i non pochi pregi del volume, mentre sono invece costretto a richiamar l'attenzione su certi difetti, che si vorrebbe sparissero da una ristampa. Compito ingrato che mi è imposto appunto dai meriti complessivi dell' opera.

È sempre malagevole il contenere in un brevissimo ambito una introduzione che voglia dare sinteticamente i risultati delle ricerche antiche e moderne intorno alle varie scuole poetiche e ai vari poeti. Un' esposizione siffatta deve esser garbata e imparziale, e presuppone una vasta e sicura informazione. Sì che non è meraviglia, se il discorso introduttivo presta il fianco a più d'un rimarco. Già, in generale, a mala pena si scorge la necessità di tale discorso. Quanti sono capaci d'intendere le poesie qui raccolte dovrebbero presumersi in possesso d'una più che discreta cultura letteraria, e questa renderebbe la prefazione superflua. Se le notiziuole biografiche relegate nelle note fossero state meno magre e scheletriche, sarebbero, a mio avviso, riuscite sufficienti a rammentare ai lettori quel tanto che di ciascun poeta poteva a loro esser necessario d'aver presente, e quel tanto che un libro di questo genere poteva dare. Ma, per amore di uniformità con gli altri volumi della collana, una introduzione ci voleva, e questa, che ci sta innanzi, non eccede le giuste proporzioni ed è briosamente dettata, ma è anche afflitta quà e là da idee poco chiare e poco precisamente espresse.

Così intorno alla prima fioritura lirica in volgare si sarebbe dovuto meglio lumeggiare come l'incoraggiamento regale del 'secondo vento di Soave' favorisse una tendenza che prendeva le sue mosse di lontano, dall' influsso delle letterature d'*oc* e d'*oïl*. Il Lucas, più oltre, nota a ragione che la poesia della scuola siciliana era essenzialmente di corte, benchè contenesse elementi d'altra natura, ma non è altrettanto giusto d'asserire che la tenzone di Cielo (il Lucas scrive Ciullo) introducesse un motivo nuovo nella lirica del tempo, quando si pensi agli esempi di Francia e di Provenza. A proposito del famoso *Contrasto*, che si poteva benessimo trascurare, se il Lucas pensava non ne fosse adatta la chiusa *virginibus puerisque*, non so a lui perdonare d' averne, sul l' esempio di certa vecchia stampa, tralasciata gran parte senza neppure far cenno dell' omissione. Le righe dedicate alla popolarità dei poemi di lingua d'*oïl*, benchè opportune, peccano d'imprecisione quando dicono di quell' ibrido connubio il dialetto Franco-Veneto. E non so davvero come si possa affermare senz' altro che Paolo e Francesca leggessero di Lancillotto in un rifacimento Franco-Veneto (p. 5). In primo luogo non tutti ammettono come storia che il pietoso romanzo affrettasse il fallo de' due cognati[1], poi Dante in ogni caso non conobbe un testo di tal genere, ma un vero testo francese[2]. Guido Guinizelli non trova

[1] Il Boccaccio nel suo commento dice il racconto sostanzialmente storico; e a lui è propenso a dar fede il Novati in *Freschi e Minii del Dugento*, Milano 1910, p. 57 segg., ma con peritanza che non giustifica la recisa affermazione del Lucas.

[2] Fu anche pubblicato nei *Dante Studies and Researches* di Paget Toynbee, London, 1902, pp. 1—37.

grazia presso il nostro autore; secondo lui Guido 'sang or rather reasoned' (p. 6), ma, a prescindere dalle lodi dantesche, non è vero che il contenuto filosofico infuso nella lirica dal Bolognese costituisce a un tempo il pregio e la novità della poesia di *stil nuovo*, e che in certi suoi componimenti[1] il Guinizelli appare poeta dotato di cuore caldo e accesa fantasia e una certa rude possanza d'espressione? Qualche volta la parola tradisce il pensiero: il Lucas non può non sapere quanto sia periglioso e dubbio il parlare di pura poesia popolare a proposito di Jacopone. Anche qualche troppo recisa affermazione intorno alla *Vita Nuova* e al canzoniere dantesco può ingenerare errori, ma dopo tutto le tre massime figure del trecento sono delineate con sufficiente precisione, se pur appaiano alquanto isolate nel tempo, perchè purtroppo le condizioni storiche sono tratteggiate con frasi tolte a prestito dalle retorica. Che ci stanno a fare le continue frecciate contro il papato, e perchè Galeazzo e Bernabò (non Bernabo in ogni caso) Visconti son detti 'most bestial of tyrants' (p. 12)? Ben si sceglieva gli amici e i protettori il Petrarca, il quale appunto presso Galeazzo e Bernabò visse tra il 1354 e il 1361; e quanti altri de' signori del tempo, e di prima e di poi, non potrebbero contendere con vantaggio, se si prescindesse dalle condizioni storiche, il posto d'onore tra i *tiranni bestiali* ai due Visconti? Le pagine dedicate all' Umanesimo e in generale al Rinascimento sono assai migliori; anche il Pulci e il Boiardo ricevono lume bastevole; l'Ariosto e il Tasso sono alquanto meno avventurati, l'attenzione dell' autore essendo un po' troppo accentrata intorno a Firenze e alla lirica. L'Arcadia è discorsa sulle orme della Vernon Lee, ma dove ha mai trovata traccia di realtà il Lucas nelle commedie del Gozzi (p. 26)? Il resto, se si eccettui qualche esagerazione a proposito dell' Alfieri, è commendevole.

Il Lucas dichiara un certo letterario disprezzo per la critica professorale, forse per ciò egli ha trascurato di valersi di edizioni critiche; non cita le stampe dalle quali trae i suoi testi, sì che se ne assume, *ipso facto*, la responsabilità e, disgraziatamente, quale più e quale meno tutte le liriche dugentesche son derivate da edizioni non buone[2], quando per esse soccorreva almeno la notissima *Crestomazia* del Monaci. Ma non ho agio di soffermarmi su ciascun autore e vengo all' Alighieri, poichè il modo, in cui questo grande è trattato, è caratteristico per tutti, caratteristico voglio dire anche di una certa fretta con cui i gruppi di rime sono a volte raccozzati[3]. Poichè di tutte le rime non abbiamo ancora un' edizione critica il Lucas si sarebbe potuto giovare della comoda e diffusissima ristampa del Moore, avrebbe evitato

[1] Cfr. la fine della famosa canzone, e i sonetti 'Chi vedesse a Lucia' e 'Volvol te levi.

[2] Già la disposizione strofica delle *Laudi* di S. Francesco, e del *Contrasto* di Cielo ne fanno fede. Perchè poi a p. 6 leggiamo Pier' della Vigna, Ciacco d' Anguillaia, mentre nel testo si ha correttamente Pier della Vigna e Ciacco dell' Anguillaia?

[3] Ecco l'ordinamento delle rime dantesche secondo la numerazione del Moore: prima sei canzoni: XX, *Canz.*, allegorica; VI, *Conv.*; entrambe seriori alla terza: I, *V.N.*, poi II, IV, V, *V.N.*; poi undici sonetti, XXXII, XXIX, XL, *Canz.*; XI, XIV, XV, XVII, XXIII, XXIV, XVIII, XXV, *V.N.*; e infine ancora una canzone, e quale? nientemeno che quella 'O patria degna,' oggimai quasi universalmente ascritta ad Albertino della Piagentina.

così lezioni ormai universalmente ripudiate[1]. Mi sto contento alle prove recate nelle note, sufficienti, credo a mostrare come alcuni testi richiedano un' accurata revisione; qualche menda si potrebbe segnalare anche per il resto dell' antologia, ma son più piccole a petto dell' altre e tali da non menomarne gran fatto il pregio.

Non son piccole all' incontro le mende che si riscontrano nelle note. Hanno queste, mi sembra, il difetto capitale di non esser metodiche. Vedasi qualche esempio. Mentre di nessuno degli autori più antichi si ricorda un' edizione, a un tratto, giunti a Cino se ne cita una; quale? Non quella poco ragguardevole a cura del Bindi e del Fanfani (1878), non quella del Carducci (1907), non quella del Volpi (1907), ma ancora l' edizione pistoiese del Ciampi (1826). Dopo un considerevole intervallo si trovano ricordate le edizioni carducciane del Poliziano e di Lorenzo il Magnifico, e così via si interrompono le lacune con ricordi, frammisti di buone stampe e di mediocri, finchè, giunti all' Alamanni, non soltanto troviamo menzione dell' edizione Le Monnier (1859), ma anche di uno studio critico, quello dell' Hauvette; ottimo, ma di grazia non v' era proprio nessun scritto degno di memoria intorno agli autori più antichi e a quelli più recenti? Dimenticavo: qualche cosa c' è anche qui: si citano l' opera della Vernon Lee sul secolo XVIII e la vita del Metastasio scritta dallo Stendhal. Ma questo in tal campo è assolutamente tutto.

Le note tuttavia non sono soltanto bibliografiche e le notiziuole intorno alla vita degli autori sono succinte assai, ma precise a sufficienza; lodevoli quindi. Le chiose esplicative invece che avrebbero dovuto agevolare la comprensione dei testi a coloro che non sono versati nel lessico antico o non posseggono precisa informazione degli avvenimenti di cui si tocca, sono di bel nuovo prive di metodo e insufficienti. Eccone pochi esempi, i primi tratti dal *Contrasto* di Cielo. Non si commentano: *focora*, I, 5; *este*, I, 16; *aio*, I, 7; si spiega *abere*, II 5, e allora perchè non *bolontate*, I, 6? Il Lucas chiosa *aggio*, nella canzone di Federico, e non *aio*, I, 7, nè so vedere perchè ritenga una forma dell' altra meglio intelligibile ai profani. E che dire di *veioti*, III, 5; *difesa*, IV, 3; *patreto*, V, 5 (vero è che *patremo*, IV, 3, è spiegato)? Che significa quell' *a* così senza segno di sorta, VI, 7; VII, 6? E che *anno*, VII, 2, e che *er*, VIII, 5? Non erano da chiarir queste forme piuttosto che non *gueri*, VIII, 8, che ha un vicino ed esatto corrispondente nel ben noto *guari*? E non erano da chiosare *sciantora*, IX, 1 e quello strano *aero*, XI, 2, che nulla significa ed è una cattiva lettura d' antica stampa per *cleri*? Potrei seguitare a lungo, ma vediamo per brevità il gustoso casetto che ci si fa innanzi con la canzone di Pier della Vigna. A p. 535 si legge nelle note: *aulente cera* = *odoroso volto*; nel testo a p. 42 il 21° verso si chiude invece con le parole *aulente lena*. D' onde questa strana discordanza? I MSS. hanno *lena*, che gli antichi editori corressero in *cera* per mantenere la rima con l' ottavo verso della stanza

[1] Per esempio la lezione 'Bice' invece che 'Lagia' al v. 9 del sonetto 'Guido vorrei,' lezione di tanto momento per il problema degli amori danteschi.

che nei MSS. suona *spera*, mentre è qui *spena*[1]. Non discuto la lezione, il fatto per noi importante è la discrepanza tra il testo e la nota; discrepanza che potrebbe essere per molti versi significativa. *Messo t' ho innanzi, omai per te ti ciba.* Le chiose storiche e personali sono esatte in genere, ma parecchie altre sarebbero ben state opportune[2]. Qualche minuzia si può appuntare quà e là: l' *Aminta* fu rappresentato nel 1573 non nel 1572 (p. 555) ed è un brutto errore di stampa quel *Burisio*, per *Bosisio* a p. 559.

Il guaio precipuo di questo volume si è che i pregi suoi innegabili ne rendon più perspicue le mancanze, che, se su queste fu mio dovere di fermar l'attenzione, miglior ventura avranno i lettori, liberi di gustare in esso le dolci rime in degna cornice presentate.

CESARE FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Stendhal et l'Angleterre. Par DORIS GUNNELL. Préface de M. Ad. Paupe. Paris, Charles Bosse, 1909. 8°. x + 322 pp.

Cette étude sur Stendhal et l'Angleterre est la thèse de 'Doctorat d'Université' que Miss Doris Gunnell a soutenue en Sorbonne, il y a déjà quelque trois ans; nous ne saurions donc exiger de ce travail, qui est d'ailleurs—et je m'empresse de le constater—de beaucoup au dessus de la moyenne—les solides qualités d'érudition et de jugement critique que nous serions eu droit d'attendre d'une thèse de 'Doctorat-ès-Lettres.' Quoi qu'il en soit, la thèse de Miss Gunnell est d'une lecture facile et agréable et, pour la première fois, nous avons, présentés d'une façon assez méthodique, les jugements que l'incorrigible dandy, 'le père de Taine, de Zola et de Bourget,' porta sur l'Angleterre et sa littérature.

La tâche dont Miss Gunnell s'est honorablement acquittée nécessitait des recherches longues et ingrates: il s'agissoit de parcourir les œuvres de Stendhal, de dérouiller sa correspondance et d'y relever les nombreux passages où, à propos et hors de propos, Beyle fit preuve de son ignorance de l'Anglais, de l'homme aussi bien que de la langue. Les résultats de cette enquête si consciencieuse ne sont pas favorables à l'auteur du *Rouge et noir*. Malgré ses quatre séjours en Angleterre, malgré ses amies et amis d'Outremanche, dont Miss Gunnell nous a peut-être trop longuement parlé, malgré son admiration pour Shakespeare, et malgré ses lectures nombreuses et variées, Stendhal ne fut et ne

[1] I MSS. danno rispettivamente *lena* e *spera*; il Monaci, *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli*, p. 57, credette si trattasse di un caso di assonanza. Invece il Butler, *The Forerunners of Dante*, p. 149, propose una nuova correzione: lascia *lena* e muta *spera* in *spena*; la correzione può sembrare ardita, ma il Lucas l'accoglie senz' altro nel testo della canzone, dimenticandosi d'aver chiosata invece l'altra lettura.

[2] Per esempio, p. 88, v. 2; pp. 261, 296 ecc.

pouvait être qu'un critique fort médiocre. Sa méthode était subjective à outrance, ses jugements variaient comme son humeur et ne sont que des aperçus: 'quel qu'on soit, roi ou berger, sur le trône ou portant la houlette, on a toujours raison de sentir comme on sent et de trouver *beau* ce qui donne du plaisir.' 'This is this to me and that to thee!' et les impressions fugitives de Beyle ont un aspect si déconcertant que l'on se demande si l'on doit prendre au sérieux un écrivain qui déclare que 'rien ne peut égaler son amour pour la littérature des Anglais, si ce n'est son éloignement pour leurs personnes.' En réalité Stendhal fut un psychologue individualiste dans toute la force du terme; il s'est moqué du touriste anglais qui visite musées et églises et qui, lui au moins, ne voit et ne trouve rien; en passant en Angleterre, en se servant de la littérature anglaise pour attaquer la tragédie classique, Stendhal a pu changer de milieu mais il n'a su chercher partout que l'expression de son moi et de ses goûts personnels: il n'a pas voulu se mettre au même niveau que 'ces juges dont l'âme manque de sensibilité et de *folie romanesque*, mais qui du reste ont étudié avec l'exactitude et la persévérance d'un caractère froid tout ce qui a été dit ou écrit sur l'art malheureux qu'ils affligent de leur culte.' Nous aurions tort d'insister.

Un tel système ne peut avoir que de fâcheux résultats: les jugements de Stendhal sur la société anglaise et la littérature manquent de sympathie et de profondeur; la religion pour lui devient le cant et Scott ne pense qu'à décrire...'J'ai oublié de peindre ce salon, Sir Walter Scott et ses imitateurs eussent commencé par là, mais moi, j'abhorre la description matérielle.' Cette masse confuse et mal équilibrée contient, de temps à autre, quelques remarques plus vraies qui nous rapprochent de Taine (pp. 90–91, 105), et Stendhal enfin a reconnu le génie de Fielding: 'Ce roman est aux autres ce que l'Iliade est aux poèmes épiques[1].'

L'intérêt de cette étude semble donc être entièrement biographique et le romancier du *Rouge et Noir* est assez grand pour que l'on puisse se passer du critique. Je laisserai de coté le chapitre qui traite de l'influence de la littérature anglaise sur Stendhal et dont les conclusions sont bien vagues et timides, et je me bornerai à signaler les points les plus nouveaux que nous devons aux recherches de Miss Gunnell. Stendhal écrivit de nombreux articles pour les revues anglaises et le fit 'for fiche' (lisez—'fish'—'argent'); l'on nous en a donné une liste complète et ces articles anonymes parurent dans le *New Monthly Magazine*, le *London Magazine*, l'*Athenœum* et la *Paris Monthly Review*; le cas de Beyle ne fut pas une exception à cette époque car l'*Athenœum* de 1828 contient de longs articles qui lui vinrent d'écrivains français. Miss Gunnell s'est également préoccupée de relever les plagiats d'auteurs anglais; le premier et le plus intéressant (pp. 249–259) nous montre Stendhal empruntant à Johnson tous les arguments dont il se servit pour démolir le théâtre classique. Dans son *Racine et*

[1] Miss Gunnell a oublié de nous dire de quel roman il s'agissait, *Tom Jones* ou *Jonathan Wild*?

Shakespeare Stendhal a non seulement emprunté, mais il a traduit mot pour mot; il était d'ailleurs coutumier du fait. Est-il bien vrai, toutefois, que ce plagiat 'ait échappé à la vigilance des critiques'? Je ne sais, mais, en 1908, l'année où Miss Gunnell a présenté sa thèse (15 juin), Professor W. Raleigh publia *Johnson on Shakespeare*, et je trouve dans l'introduction les deux passages suivants (p. xxiv): 'Like all great critics, he (Johnson) can understand the excellence of opposite kinds. Indeed, in his defence of Shakespeare's neglect of the unities, he passes over to the side of the enemy and almost becomes a romantic.'...'The transformation was completed after his death. I am indebted to Mr W. P. Ker for pointing out to me that Henri Beyle in his *Racine et Shakespeare* (1822) translates all that Johnson says on the unities and appropriates it as the manifesto of the young romantics. But he told not them that he had taken the honey out of the carcass of the lion.' Je laisse donc la découverte à qui de droit, mais Miss Gunnell trouve ce plagiat 'piquant'; il aurait fallu nous l'expliquer, nous en faire comprendre, comme Professor W. Raleigh l'a fait, le sens profond et être enfin un peu plus critique que Stendhal.

Ce manque d'esprit critique est le défaut le plus saillant de l'étude de Miss Gunnell; il y en a malheureusement d'autres qui déroutent le lecteur. Nous savons certes, que Beyle ne se piquait pas de constance dans ses opinions, mais ces contradictions n'ont pas été présentées comme elles auraient dû l'être; elles surprennent et ennuient. 'Un Anglais qui voyage par la diligence de Bath se garde bien de parler et de plaisanter sur la chose du monde la plus indifférente; il peut trouver dans son voisin un homme d'une classe ennemie, un méthodiste ou un tory furieux, qui lui répondra en l'envoyant paître' (p. 78)...et un peu plus loin (p. 109). 'Pas un Anglais sur cent n'ose être lui-même... dire ce qu'il pense, et non pas ce que pense tout le monde, laisser s'épancher son caractère dans toute son individualité.'

La connaissance profonde que l'auteur a du français ne fait aucun doute; une revision un peu plus sévère aurait fait justice des quelques fautes que la sanction officielle a négligées; les phrases lourdes et gauches, les expressions familières, ambiguës ou redondantes—'la belle humeur parfaite' (p. 248)—sont assez nombreuses. En résumé, la thèse de Miss Gunnell est un heureux début que le Stendhal-Club a eu raison d'encourager, car c'est un travail utile et consciencieux.

J. J. Champenois.

Oxford.

Translations of German Poetry in American Magazines, 1741—1810. By EDWARD ZIEGLER DAVIS. Philadelphia: Americana Germanica Press. 1905. 8vo. viii + 229 pp.

German Literature in American Magazines prior to 1846. By SCOTT HOLLAND GOODNIGHT. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin: Philology and Literature Series, IV, 1.) Madison, Wis. 1907. 8vo. 264 pp.

German Literature in American Magazines, 1846—1880. By MARTIN HENRY HAERTEL. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin: Philology and Literature Series, IV, 2.) Madison, Wis. 1908. 8vo. 188 pp.

The growth of interest in German literature and history in America has been studied in much detail during the last few years, and these volumes supply a wealth of information on the general critical attitude of that country during the last century. Magazine literature is apt to be a dreary tract with points of interest separated by long distances; but its repetition of ideas and often short-sighted judgments gauge well the current opinion, and reveal its fashions and prejudices. Even the faults of a translation which insists on introducing 'blushing maids' unknown to the German author into the simplicity of an evening song, or the sensibility that added several stanzas to a translation of Bürger's *Lenore*, which restore the dead lover and ruin the effect of the poem, bear witness to the taste of the period. Magazines supply in many cases the first notices of foreign books, and attention is drawn by Mr Haertel and Mr Davis to the greater importance of the magazine in America at the beginning of the century, when there were few libraries, and the difficulties of obtaining books were greater than in England.

The two theses on German literature in the magazines trace in some detail the growth of the study of German with its fluctuations, and the kind of interest taken in various authors during the periods into which the century naturally falls. In the second parts the criticism of the greater writers, Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller, etc., is traced separately and followed out more closely. This arrangement involves a certain amount of repetition, but it has the advantage of giving a clear view from two different standpoints. In the first volume Dr Goodnight notes the late introduction of German literature into America, and the difficulty of obtaining books; during the first period till 1817, when Everett and Ticknor returned from Germany and gave a new impulse to the study akin to that given by Carlyle in England, and even at the beginning of their campaign, criticism was very largely dependent on the English magazines. No detailed comparison with English criticism has been attempted, though this might yield interesting results; the history of German literature in our magazines is, however, being undertaken at the University of Wisconsin and the comparison may follow. It must be remembered that the difficulty

with regard to books was not peculiar to America; as late as 1817 R. P. Gillies speaks in his *Memoirs* of his vain quest for them and of the impossibility of discovering a teacher. Still the progress of German translation in the two countries was not altogether similar; and though many of the American publications were reprints of English editions, the American enthusiasm for Schiller, Kotzebue, and Goethe, which began later than the English, was even quicker to develop and fuller in its results. *The Robbers* and *Fiesco* were both acted in America but not in England, with the exception of a feeble adaptation of the former by Holman under the title of *The Red Cross Knights*. Also while most of Kotzebue's plays produced here were reprinted in the States, several original translations were added to the list, and at the high tide of Kotzebue's popularity, 1799, fourteen plays were acted in America but only eight in England. Some translations even preceded English ones, as did Dunlap's version of Zschokke's once so fascinating romance of *Abällino*. This being so, we might expect some independence in American criticism.

In the summaries to both the earlier and the later periods however, national characteristics are clearly brought out, principally the strong Puritan element which found it hard to reconcile itself to the morals of Goethe, and having yielded thus much, was again thrown into antagonism by the introduction of Heine. Another characteristic visible throughout is a tendency to set realism and practical usefulness above imagination and theoretical power. The philosophers did not receive so much attention as the poets: at first even, the tendency to philosophy was regarded as a blemish; and in the era of the novel, what took the public fancy was not thoughtful development of character so much as true analysis, or vivid description of reality. The deep thinking and experience of *Wilhelm Meister* were thrown aside, while Auerbach and Reuter found easy recognition. The Romantic school as a whole was regarded as morbid and little encouraged, and even Schiller seems to have suffered neglect from a feeling that his idealism was not sufficiently in touch with the actualities of life. Comparison with English reviews would probably bring these qualities into greater relief, for in their repudiation of German morals the English critics were less earnest, and generally contented themselves with referring to Teutonic extravagance. The national character is also emphasised by Dr Haertel in the second part, where he brings out the influence of political history on the general study and on the appreciation of the novel in particular. In the history of the novel it would have been interesting to note points of contact with that of the American novel itself, and reference to the influence of German literature on Longfellow's work, especially with regard to the lyric, would have been of value.

The lists of articles in the magazines seem to be fully and carefully made, and the index of authors with the dates of articles referring to them makes it easy to trace the rise or decline of interest in each. One slip has been noticed in Dr Goodnight's text where he attributes

the adaptation of Kotzebue's *Stranger* for the English stage to Sheridan. Of course Sheridan's work was the adaptation of *Pizarro*, 1799. *The Stranger* was translated by several hands in 1798.

Dr Davis's collection of German poems from the magazines also shows careful editing. The admission of any poems on Germany or kindred subjects is good, but we feel that these ought to stand in a group by themselves and distinction should be made between such verses as an *Ode on the late victory of the King of Prussia* and a purely literary subject like the parodies on Bürger's Ballads. It surely would have been an improvement to separate section III into two parts, one containing poems and translations referring to Germany, Denmark, etc., and one including imitations and burlesques of German literary work. At present section III presents a rather miscellaneous appearance.

These volumes should be of great service to those working in a similar field, besides providing an interesting summary of a very wide expanse of material.

MARGARET W. COOKE.

LONDON.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

March—May, 1911.

GENERAL.

Brugmann, K. and B. Delbrück, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. II. Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 16 M.

Elster, E., Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft. II. Band. Stilistik. Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Hovelacque, A., La linguistique, histoire naturelle du langage. Paris, Scheicher. 1 fr. 95.

Lectures on Literature. Columbia University Lectures. New York, Columbia Univ. Press.

Levy, P., Geschichte des Begriffes Volkslied. (Acta Germanica, VII, 3.) Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 8 M.

Spadoni, C., L' idea religiosa in alcune opere della letteratura contemporanea (G. Pascoli, P. Bourget, A. Fogazzaro, J. K. Huysmans, A. Oriani, A. Graf, G. Negri). Reggio Emilia, P. Borghi. 3 L. 50.

Stappfer, P., Humour et humoristes. Henry Fielding, Jean Paul Frédéric Richter, Anatole France, la comtesse Mathieu de Noailles. Paris, Fischbacher. 3 fr. 50.

Studies in Language and Literature. In Celebration of the seventieth Birthday of J. M. Hart. New York, H. Holt.

Taylor, H. O., The Mediaeval Mind. A History of the Development of Thought and Emotion in the Middle Ages. 2 vols. London, Macmillan. 21*s.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 1. Lieferung. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, III.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Italian.

Bandello, M., Le Novelle, a cura di G. Brognoligo. Vol. III. (Scrittori d' Italia, IX.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Batacchi, D. L., Le Novelle. Vol. II, preceduto da uno studio biografico e critico di F. Tribolati. Florence, Stab. Tip. Aldino. 15 L.

Berni, F., Orlando innamorato, di M. M. Boiardo. Testo scelto, compendiato e annotato da S. Ferrari, pubblicato a cura di G. Albini. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 2 L. 50.

Boccaccio, G., Il Decamerone. Ediz. Alinari. IV. Giornata. Florence, R. Bemporad. 12 L.

Chiappelli, A., Opere varie. Serie I, Vol. I. (Pagine di critica letteraria.) Florence, Le Monnier. 5 L.

Cocai, M. (Folengo, T.), Le maccheronee, a cura di A. Luzio. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, x.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Colagrosso, F., Le dottrine stilistiche del Leopardi e la sua prosa. (Biblioteca nazionale.) Florence, Le Monnier. 3 L. 50.

Dante Alighieri, The Vita Nuova. A new edition illustrated by D. G. Rossetti and containing two chapters by A. Agresti, and revised by M. de Rubris. London, Dulau. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Ferrari, V., Letteratura italiana moderna e contemporanea (1718—1911). 3a ediz. rifatta e aumentata. (Manuali Hoepli.) Milan, Hoepli. 3 L.

Fiammazzo, A., Il codice dantesco della biblioteca di Savona. Savona, Tip. D. Bertolotto. 2 L. 50.

Glasenapp, G. von, A. Tassoni und sein 'Geraubter Eimer.' Ein italienischer Dichter des 17. Jahrh. Dresden, R. Lincke. 4 M.

Levi, G. A., Storia del pensiero di G. Leopardi. Turin, Fratelli Bocca. 2 L. 50.

Marconcini, C., L' Accademia della Crusca, dalle origini alla prima edizione del vocabolario (1612). 3 L.

Massarani, T., Edizione postuma delle opere. Gruppo II, Vol. VI, VII. (Storia e fisiologia dell' arte di ridere.) Each 4 L.

Muratori, L. A., Epistolario, edito e curato da M. Campori. XII. (1749–50). Modena, Soc. Tip. Modenese. 12 L.

Paggi, G., Contributo statistico alla biografia di Dante. Jeri, Tip. Editr. Flori. 1 L. 50.

Segrè, C., Relazioni letterarie fra Italia e Inghilterra: studi. (Biblioteca Nazionale.) Florence, Le Monnier. 4 L.

Tassoni, A., Le lettere di A. Tassoni pubblicate da G. Rossi. Vol. II. Bologna, Romagnoli dall' Acqua. 11 L.

Viglio, A., G. Gozzi pedagogista: note. Racconigi, Tip. F. Bruciafreddo. 2 L.

Vittorelli, I., Poesie, a cura di A. Simioni. (Scrittori d' Italia, XII.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Spanish.

Calderón de la Barca, P., Ausgewählte Werke in 10 Bänden herausg. von W. von Wurzbach. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 6 M.

Lazarillo de Tormes. An Hand der deutschen Übersetzungen des 17. Jahrhunderts aus dem Spanischen übersetzt und eingeleitet von H. Rausse. (Bibl. des 17. und 18. Jahrh.) Stuttgart, Franckh. 2 M.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M., Antología de poetas líricos castellanos desde la formación del idioma hasta nuestros días. Tomo v. (Biblioteca Clásica, CLXXXVIII.) Madrid, Hernando y Co.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M., Calderón y su Teatro. 4ta ed. Madrid, Tip. de los Archivos.

Padilla, S., Gramática histórico-crítica de la Lengua española. Madrid, Imp. Helénica.

Retana, W. E., Noticias histórico-bibliográficas de el Teatro en Filipinas desde sus orígenes hasta 1898. Madrid, Imprenta Alemana.

Rios de Lampérez, B. de los, Las mujeres de Tirso. Conferencia Madrid, B. Rodríguez.

Provençal.

Debenedetti, S., Gli studi provenzali nel cinquecento. Turin, Loescher. 10 L.

Pillet, A., Beiträge zur Kritik der ältesten Troubadours. (Aus '89. Jahresbericht d. schles. Gesell. f. vaterl. Kultur.') Breslau, Aderholz. 80 pf.

Schultz-Gora, O., Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch. 2. Aufl. (Sammlung romanischer Elementarbücher, III.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

Smythe, B., Trobador Poets. Selections from the poems of eight Trobadors. Translated with Introduction and Notes. (New Medieval Library.) London, Chatto and Windus. 5*s.* net.

Stronski, S., Le Troubadour Folquet de Marseille. Édition critique, notes et glossaire. Paris, H. Champion. 12 fr.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Damm, O., Der deutsch-französische Jargon in der schönen französischen Literatur. (Romanische Studien, XI.) Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 50.

Gilliéron, J. et É. Edmond, Atlas linguistique de la France. Paris, Champion. 875 fr.

Hartmann, E., Syntaktische Studien über die Temporalsätze im Französischen. Marburg, Elwert. 2 M. 50.

Schächtelin, P., Das Passé défini und Imparfait im Altfranzösischen. (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., Beihefte, XXX.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Storm, I., Större fransk Syntax. I. Artiklerne. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 Kr. 50.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Benary, W., Über die Verknüpfungen einiger französischer Epen und die Stellung des Doon de Laroche. (Aus 'Romanische Forschungen.') Erlangen, Junge. 3 M.

Chatelaine de Vergi, La. Publ. par G. Raynaud. (Classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, Champion. 80 c.

Lancelot del lac, Der altfranzösische Prosaroman von. I. Branche. Versuch einer kritischen Ausgabe von G. Bräuner. (Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie, II.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 3 M.

L'enfant sage. Die erhaltenen Versionen herausgegeben von W. Suchier. Halle, Niemeyer. 24 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Berret, P., Le moyen âge dans 'La Légende des siècles' et les sources de V. Hugo. Paris, H. Paulin. 10 fr.

Berret, P., La philosophie de Victor Hugo (1854—1859) et deux mythes de 'La Légende des siècles.' Paris, H. Paulin. 5 fr.

Bithell, J., Contemporary Belgian Poetry. Selected and translated. London, W. Scott. 1*s.*

Brizeux, A., Œuvres complètes, nouv. édit. par A. Dorchain. Tome II. Paris, Garnier frères. 3 fr. 50.

Clouzet, G., Le roman français, avec un essai sur l'histoire du roman par Ch. Simond. Paris. 2 fr.

Cyrano Bergerac, S. de, L'autre monde ou les états et empires de la lune. Zum ersten Mal kritisch herausg. von L. Jordan. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, VIII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

Donnay, M., Molière. Paris, A. Fayard. 3 fr. 50.

Flaubert, G., Œuvres complètes. Correspondance, 3e et 4e série (1854–80). Paris, L. Conard. Each 8 fr.

Gaillard de Champris, H., E. Augier et la comédie sociale. Paris, B. Grasset. 6 fr.

Griselle, E., Fénelon, études historiques. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Kohler, E., Entwicklung des biblischen Dramas des 16. Jahrh. in Frankreich unter dem Einfluss der literarischen Renaissancebewegung. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., lii.) Leipzig, A. Deichert. 2 M. 25.

Lacretelle, P. de, Les origines de la jeunesse de Lamartine (1790—1812). Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Michel, E., Chateaubriand. Interprétation médico-psychologique de son caractère. Paris, Perrin. 2 fr. 50.

Rigal, E., De Jodelle à Molière, tragédie, comédie, tragi-comédie. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Rousseau, J. B. et Brossette, Correspondance de. Notes et index de P. Bonnefon. Tome i. 1715–29. Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Senancour, E. de, Rêveries sur la nature primitive de l'homme, édit. critique par J. Merlant. Tome i. Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Spitzer, L., Die Wortbildung als stilistisches Mittel exemplifiziert an Rabelais. (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., Beihefte, xxix.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Thuasne, L., Villon et Rabelais, Notes et commentaires. Paris, Fischbacher. 12 fr.

Vaillant, E., Gustave Nadaud et la chanson française. Paris, A. Messein. 3 fr. 50.

Verlaine, P., Œuvres complètes. Tome i. Nouv. édit. Paris, A. Messein. 6 fr.

Villon, F., Œuvres, publ. par un ancien archiviste. (Classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Gothic.

Die gotische Bibel. Herausg. von W. Streitberg. ii. Teil. Gotisch-griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. (Germanische Bibliothek, ii, 3. Band, ii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 70.

Scandinavian.

Björnson, B., Gesammelte Werke in 5 Bänden. (Deutsche Volksausgabe.) Herausgegeben von J. Elias. i.—iii. Band. Berlin, Fischer. 9 M.

Edda, Den ældre. Ny Oversættelse ved O. Hansen. Copenhagen, Pio. 3 Kr.

Heiberg, J. L., Udvalgte poetiske Skrifter. Folkeudgave. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr.

Kock, A., Svensk ljudhistoria. ii, 2. Lund, Gleerup. 2 Kr.

Linck, A., J. P. Jacobsen. Et Levnetslöb. Paa Grundlag af Digterens efterladte Papirer. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr. 50.

Palladius, P., Danske Skrifter. Udgivet af L. Jacobsen. 1. Levering. Christiania, Akad. Bogh. 3 Kr. 65.

Sveriges Nationallitteratur, 1500—1900. xxii. S. Lagerlöf, G. Fröding. Utg. af R. G. Berg. xxv, 2. Finländsk litteratur utom Runeberg. Utg. af G. Castrén. Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 2 Kr.

Unwerth, W. von, Untersuchungen über Totenkult und Ódinnverehrung bei Nordgermanen und Lappen mit Exkursen zur altnordischen Literaturgeschichte. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, xxxvii.) Breslau, Marcus. 6 M.

Dutch, Frisian.

Lennep, J. van, Meesterwerken. iii. De Roos van Dekama. Leiden, A. W. Sijthoff. 1 fl. 50.

Walter, G., Der Wortschatz des Altfriesischen. Eine wortgeographische Untersuchung. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Philologie, liii.) Leipzig, A. Deichert. 2 M. 60.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

HARGREAVE, B., Origins and meanings of popular phrases and names. London, T. W. Laurie. 6*s.* net.

PALM, B., The place of the adjective attribute in English prose from the oldest times up to our days. Lund, Lindstedt. 3 Kr.

RANDNITZKY, H., Die Bell-Sweetsche Schule. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Phonetik. (Marburger Studien zur englischen Philologie, XIII.) Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 4 M. 80.

SKEAT, W. W., A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. New Impression. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

SKEAT, W. W., English Dialects from the eighth century to the present day. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

SKEAT, W. W., The Place-names of Berkshire. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* net.

STENTON, F. M., The Place-names of Berkshire. Reading, University College. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

WILLIAMS, G. J., and E. A. WALKER, History of English from the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward VII. London, A. Melrose. 3*s.* 6*d.*

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

CLARKE, M. G., Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period: being Studies from Beowulf and other Old English Poems. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

COOK, A. S., A Concordance to Beowulf. Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.

HIBBARD, L. A., Three Middle English Romances, King Horn, Havelock, Beves of Hampton, retold. London, Nutt. 2*s.* net.

LYDGATE, J., The Serpent of Division. Edited with Introduction, notes and glossary by H. N. McCracken. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press (Oxford, Univ. Press). 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Psalter, Der Cambridger. Zum ersten Male herausg. von K. Wildhagen. I. Bd. Text mit Erklärungen. (Bibl. der angels. Prosa, VII.) Hamburg, H. Grand.

WEYHE, H., Zu den altenglischen Verbalabstrakten auf -nes und -ing, -ung. Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ALEXANDER, L. C., The autobiography of Shakespeare: a fragment. London, Simpkin, Marshall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

BASKERVILLE, C. R., English elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. (Bulletin of the University of Texas, No. 178.) Austin, Texas, Univ. of Texas.

BEAUMONT, F., and J. FLETCHER, Select Plays with Introduction by W. P. Baker. (Everyman's Library.) London, J. M. Dent. 1*s.* net.

BENSON, A. C., Ruskin, a Study of Personality. London, Smith, Elder. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BÖHME, T., Spensers literarisches Nachleben bis zu Shelley. (Palaestra, XCIII.) Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 10 M.

BROWN, F. C., Elkanah Settle, his Life and Works. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press (Cambridge, Univ. Press). 5*s.* net.

BROWN, J., The History of the English Bible. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

CHESTERTON, G. K., Appreciations and Criticisms of the Works of C. Dickens. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

DANIEL, S., The Tragedy of Cleopatra nach dem Drucke von 1611 herausg. von M. Lederer. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren engl. Dramas, XXXI.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 8 fr. 50.

DIJCK, I. VAN, Macbeth en de nieuwste crimineele psychologie. Groningen, P. Noordhoff. 1 fl. 25.

Duval, G., L'œuvre shakespearienne, son histoire (1616—1910). Paris, Flammarion. 3 fr. 50.

Hedgcock, F. A., Essai de critique. Thomas Hardy, penseur et artiste, étudié dans les romans du Wessex. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

Hedgcock, F. A., Un acteur cosmopolite. David Garrick et ses amis français. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Jaggard, W., Shakespeare Bibliography. A Dictionary of every known issue of the writings of our national poet, and of recorded opinion thereon in the English language. Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare Press. 63*s*.

Ker, W. P., Thomas Warton. Warton Lecture on English Poetry. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. iv.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1*s*. net.

Moisant, X., L'optimisme au xix^e^ siècle. Carlyle, Browning, Tennyson. Paris, G. Beauchesne. 3 fr.

Polidori, J. W., Diary, 1816: relating to Byron, Shelley, etc. Edited and elucidated by W. M. Rossetti. London, E. Mathews. 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

Pollard, A. W., Records of the English Bible. The documents relating to the translation and publication of the Bible in English, 1525—1611. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s*. net.

Reismüller, G., Romanische Lehnwörter (Erstbelege) bei Lydgate. Ein Beitrag zur Lexicographie des Englischen im 15. Jahrh. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., xlviii.) Leipzig, A. Deichert. 4 M.

Shakespeare, W., King John. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. Old Spelling edition. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s*. 6*d*. net.

Sidgwick, F., Ballads and Lyrics of Love. London, Chatto. 2*s*. net.

Stevenson, G., Poems of Alexander Montgomery and other pieces from the Laing MS. 447. (Scottish Text Society.)

Whall, W. B., Shakespeare's sea terms explained. New edition. London, J. Brown. 1*s*. net.

Wright, W. A., The Hexaplar Psalter, being the Book of Psalms in six English versions. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25*s*. net.

Wulffen, E., Shakespeares grosse Verbrecher. Richard III, Macbeth, Othello. Berlin-Lichterfelde, Langenscheidt. 4 M.

German.

(*a*) *General.*

Behaghel, O., Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. 3. Aufl. (Aus H. Paul, Grundriss der germanischen Philologie.) Strassburg, Trübner. 6 M.

Eckart, R., Handbuch zur Geschichte der plattdeutschen Literatur. Bremen, C. Schünemann. 8 M.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, herausg. von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin. xxxi. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland. 10 M.

Müller-Fraureuth, K., Wörterbuch der obersächsischen und erzgebirgischen Mundarten. 4. Lieferung. Dresden, Baensch. 3 M. 50.

Ranke, F., Der Erlöser in der Wiege. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Volkssagenforschung. Munich, C. H. Beck. 2 M. 80.

Trautmann, M., Der Staat und die deutsche Sprache. Reden und Aufsätze. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 M.

(*b*) *Old High and Middle High German.*

Armitage, L., An Introduction to the Study of Old High German. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8*s*. 6*d*. net.

Brüch, J., Zur Sprache der Rede vom Glauben des armen Hartmann. Lautlehre, Formenlehre und Wortschatz nach den Reimen. (Prager deutsche Studien, xvii.) Prague, C. Bellmann. 5 M. 50.

Herchenbach, H., Das Präsenshistoricum im Mittelhochdeutschen. (Palaestra, civ.) Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 4 M. 50.

Lütjens, A., Der Zwerg in der deutschen Heldendichtung des Mittelalters. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, xxxviii.) Breslau, Marcus. 4 M.

Weinberg, I., Zu Notkers Anlautsgesetz. (Sprache und Dichtung, v.) Tübingen, Mohr. 2 M.

Wellander, E., Die Bedeutungsentwickelung der Partikel ab in der mittelhochdeutschen Verbalkomposition. Upsala, Akad. bokh. 2 Kr. 50.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Auerbach, B., Werke. Wohlfeile Ausgabe. 12 Bände. Stuttgart, Cotta. 20 M.

Briefe aus dem Vormärz. Eine Sammlung aus dem Nachlass M. Hartmanns. Herausg. von O. Wittner. (Bibl. deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, xxx.) Prague, J. G. Calve. 8 Kr.

Brischar, K. M., Deutsch-österreichische Literatur der Gegenwart. Vienna, F. Deuticke. 2 Kr. 50.

Faust, Das Volksbuch vom Doctor. Nach der ersten Ausgabe, 1587. 2. Aufl. Herausg. von R. Petsch. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrh. 7, 8.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

Fleury, V., Le poète G. Herwegh (1817–75). (Bibl. de la Révolution de 1848, vi.) Paris, Cornély. 10 fr.

Goethe, J. W. von, Gespräche. Gesamtausgabe. v. Band. Leipzig, Biedermann. 4 M.

Goethe, Der junge. Neue Ausgabe besorgt von M. Morris. ii.—v. Band. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. Each 4 M. 50.

Grillparzer, F., Gespräche und die Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit durch die Zeitgenossen. Herausg. von A. Sauer. 2. Abt. (1848—1863). (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien, xii.) Vienna, Fromme.

Grimm, J. und W., Schriften in einer Auswahl für das deutsche Volk. i. Berlin, Meyer und Jessen. 2 M. 50.

Gromaire, G., La littérature patriotique en Allemagne (1800–15). Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Gundolf, F., Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist. Berlin, G. Bondi. 7 M. 50.

Hackel, O., Die Technik der Naturschilderung in den Romanen von Charles Sealsfield. (Prager deutsche Studien, xviii.) Prague, C. Bellmann. 3 Kr. 50.

Hagemann, J., Levin Schückings Jugendjahre und literarische Frühzeit. Münster, Coppenrath. 3 M. 20.

Hebbel, F., Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe, besorgt von R. M. Werner. (Säkularausgabe in 16 Bänden.) i. Band. Berlin, Behr. 2 M. 50.

Hehn, V., Über Goethes Gedichte. Aus dessen Nachlass von E. von der Hellen. Stuttgart, Cotta. 5 M.

Heine, H., Sämtliche Werke in 10 Bänden. Herausg. von O. Walzel. i. Band. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 2 M.

Keidel, H., Die dramatischen Versuche des jungen Grillparzer. Münster, Theissing. 2 M.

Kleist, H. von, Sämtliche Werke und Briefe in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von W. Herzog. v. and vi. Band. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. Each 4 M. 50.

Körner, J., Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, ix.) Leipzig, Haessel. 6 M.

Kuh, E., Kritische und literarhistorische Aufsätze (1863–76). Herausg. von A. Schaer. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien, xiv.) Vienna, Fromme.

LEES, J., The Anacreontic Poetry of Germany in the Eighteenth Century: its relation to French and Classical Poetry. Aberdeen, the Univ. Press.

LENAU, N., Sämtliche Werke und Briefe in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von E. Castle. II. Band. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.

LESSING, G. E., Faust, mit erläuternden Beigaben, herausg. von R. Petsch. (Germanische Bibliothek, II. Abt., 4.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 20.

LESSING, G. E., Herder, Goethe, Laokoon. Selections. Edited by W. G. Howard. New York, H. Holt (London, G. Bell). 6*s*.

LÜTCKE, H., Studien zur Philosophie der Meistersänger. Gedanken und Terminologie. (Palaestra, CVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M. 50.

MERCK, J. H., Briefe an die Herzogin-Mutter Anna Amalia und an den Herzog Karl August von Sachsen-Weimar. Herausg. von H. G. Gräf. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 8 M.

MEYER-BENFEY, H., Das Drama Heinrich von Kleists. I. Band. Kleists Ringen nach einer neuen Form des Dramas. Göttingen, O. Hapke. 12 M.

MÜLLER, P., Beiträge zur Würdigung von K. Gutzkow als Lustspieldichter (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XVI.) Marburg, Elwert. 3 M.

PFIZER, P. A., Briefwechsel zweier Deutschen. Ziel und Aufgaben des deutschen Liberalismus. Herausg. von G. Küntzel. I. Text. (Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh., CXLIV.) Berlin, Behr. 4 M.

PINÈS, M., Histoire de la littérature judéo-allemande. Préface de Ch. Andler. Paris, H. Jouve. 6 fr.

PORTERFIELD, A. W., K. L. Immermann: a Study in German Romanticism. (Columbia University Germanic Studies.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

REEKS, M., The Mother of Goethe, 'Frau Aja.' London, Lane. 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

REISKE, J., F. von Gaudy als Dichter. (Palaestra, LX.) Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 3 M. 60.

SCHUPP, J. B., Streitschriften. II. Teil. Corinna. Herausg. von C. Vogt. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrh. 225—229.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

STORM, T., Briefe an F. Eggers. Berlin, Curtius. 3 M.

TIBAL, A., Hebbel, sa vie et ses œuvres de 1813 à 1845. Paris, Hachette. 12 fr.

TOPIN, A., Heine, étude. Paris, Larousse. 1 fr.

ULBRICH, F., Die Belustigungen des Verstandes und des Witzes. Ein Beitrag zur Journalistik des 18. Jahrh. (Probefahrten, XVIII.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 6 M.

Volksbücher, Die deutschen. Herausg. von R. Benz. I. Historia von D. Johann Fausten. II. Die sieben weisen Meister. Jena, Diederichs. 3 M. and 2 M.

WAGNER, R., Mein Leben. 2 Bände. Munich, Bruckmann. 20 M.

WELDEMANN, A., Die religiöse Lyrik des deutschen Katholizismus in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrh. (Probefahrten, XIX.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 4 M. 80.

WIELAND, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. II. Abt. 3. Bd. Shakespeares theatralische Werke. 6—8. Teil. Berlin, Weidmann, 12 M.

Wiener Haupt- und Staatsaktionen. Herausg. von R. Payer von Thurn. II. Band. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien, XIII.) Vienna, Fromme.

WÜST, P., G. Keller und C. F. Meyer in ihrem persönlichen und literarischen Verhältnis. Leipzig, Haessel. 3 M. 50.

ZAUNERT, P., Bürgers Verskunst. (Beiträge zur deutschen Litteraturwissenschaften, XIII.) Marburg, Elwert. 3 M.